

DAVID HUME OF GODSCROFT: HIS LIFE AND WORK

Flora Nan Gilfillan

Presented for the degree of Ph.D.

University of Edinburgh

July 1994



## CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Abstract of Thesis   | ii          |
| Declaration  | v           |
| Abbreviations and Conventions  | vi          |
| Acknowledgements   | vii         |
| Chapter One.     DAVID HUME: SCOTO BRITANNUS   | 1           |
| Chapter Two.     THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF DOUGLAS:<br>THE MANUSCRIPT AND THE 1644 EDITION | 46          |
| Chapter Three.   THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF ANGUS:<br>THE MANUSCRIPT AND THE 1644 EDITION   | 87          |
| Chapter Four.     HUME OF GODSCROFT AS HISTORIOGRAPHER                                       | 160         |
| Chapter Five.     GODSCROFT THE POET   | 217         |
| Chapter Six.     CONCLUSION  | 269         |
| APPENDIX A:     BONDS OF MANRENT AND ALLIANCE IN<br>THE HAMILTON MANUSCRIPT                  | 281         |
| APPENDIX B:     THE ANGUS AND HAMILTON MANUSCRIPTS   | 286         |
| APPENDIX C:     DAVID HUME'S HISTORY OF THE HUMES<br>OF WEDDERBURN                           | 289         |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY   | 417         |



## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The name of David Hume first emerges in the 1580s and receives sporadic mention thereafter, giving the impression that he played only a minor role in the politics of the period in which he lived. That was certainly not the case. On the contrary, his significance was considerable. Sadly, there is a great dearth of documentary evidence. The exact dates of his birth and death, for example, are unknown. This thesis is an attempt to piece together as much as possible of his life and to show how significant he was in influencing events in the troubled period of James's minority.

Rejoicing in the Union of the Crowns and its potential for a united Britain, Hume describes himself as 'Scoto Britannus'. That designation fully represents his awareness, not only of the political realities of a united Britain but his strong sense of a Scottish and British heritage and beyond that of the great classical tradition of which he was both inheritor and expositor. First and foremost, however, he was a Scot.

Hume's importance was to become clearer with the role he took in the continuing debate on bishops and their place in James's religious scheme of things. From that he emerged as a most articulate spokesman of the

presbyterian cause, though it is significant he was not a churchman, and his influence on that cause continued after his death.

Hume is, of course, most widely known as the author of the History of the House of Douglas and Angus, published posthumously in London in 1644. An opportunity is now given to compare the published text of that work with the contents of a recently rediscovered manuscript in the Hamilton archives, which provides a rich source of material previously untapped. While the History, which places Hume securely in the Scottish historiographical tradition, has received attention, much less well known is his family history De Familia Humia Wedderburnesi, which was not intended for publication but gives an unrivalled account of the life of a Border laird. It also sets out in vivid detail the values he himself possessed and which he held up for his nephew to follow.

Godscroft is now largely known as a historian but in his own time his renown was to a large extent based on his poetic achievements. He wrote Latin poetry of remarkable quality, full of evocations and echoes of the great classical writers. In his poems he reveals his political sympathies and makes apt comments on the world he knows, and his poetry shows quite clearly how easy it was for a humanist to become a Calvinist. Above all, he shows his ability to express his thoughts and feelings on a par with the best of his age.

A many-sided man, whose talents impinged on the great movements of his age, David Hume of Godscroft's life and work contribute to a better understanding of the period he lived in and the issues of the time.

I declare that this is my own work and that no part of it has previously been published.

Flora N Gilfillan

July 1994

## ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

The following is a list of abbreviations of libraries and depositories and of abbreviated titles of works commonly referred to in the text. The latter generally follow the styles recommended in 'List of abbreviated titles of the printed sources of Scottish history to 1560', SHR, xlii (1963).

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <u>ADCP</u>      | <u>Acts of the Lords of Council in Public Affairs 1501-1554: Selections from Acta Dominorum Concilii</u> , ed. R.K. Hannay (Edinburgh, 1932). |
| <u>APS</u>       | <u>The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland</u> , ed. T. Thomson & C. Innes, 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1814-75).                                    |
| <u>BL</u>        | British Library, London.  |
| <u>BUK</u>       | <u>Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland</u> , ed. T. Thomson, 3 vols. (Bannatyne Club, 1839-45).              |
| <u>CSP Scot.</u> | <u>Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603</u> , eds. J. Bain et al., 13 vols. (1898-1969).         |
| <u>EHR</u>       | <u>English Historical Review</u> , London.  |
| <u>EUL</u>       | Edinburgh University Library.   |
| <u>HMC</u>       | Historical Manuscripts Commission, London.  |
| <u>NLS</u>       | National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.  |
| <u>PRO</u>       | Public Record Office, London.   |
| <u>RMS</u>       | <u>Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum</u> , eds. J.M. Thomson et al., 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1882-1912).                                    |
| <u>RPC</u>       | <u>Register of the Privy Council of Scotland</u> , eds. J.H. Burton et al., 14 vols. (Edinburgh, 1877- ).                                     |
| <u>RSCHS</u>     | <u>Records of the Scottish Church History Society</u> , Edinburgh.  |
| <u>RSS</u>       | <u>Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum</u> , eds. M. Livingstone et al., 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1908- ).                                    |
| <u>SHR</u>       | <u>Scottish Historical Review</u> , Edinburgh and Aberdeen.   |
| <u>SRO</u>       | Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh.  |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is no doubt that without the advice and encouragement of Professor Lynch this thesis would never have been completed. I cannot express adequately my gratitude to him for his kindness and concern. At the same time I have been fortunate to have had the expert and willing assistance of the members of the Special Collections Department in the Edinburgh University Library, the National Library of Scotland and the Scottish Record Office as well as West Register House. I have been fortunate in being able to meet Professor Williamson who has made various helpful suggestions and whose writing first roused my interest in David Hume of Godscroft.

Most significant in my research has been access to the Hamilton Manuscript, for which I thank His Grace the Duke of Hamilton.

The knowledge and expertise of Mrs Doris Williamson has rendered the typing process virtually painless, at least for me. I am extremely grateful to her.

Finally I must recognise the tolerance and encouragement of my family.

I take full responsibility for any errors and omissions.

## CHAPTER ONE

DAVID HUME: SCOTO BRITANNUS

Mention the name David Hume today and everybody assumes one is referring to the eighteenth-century philosopher. The reputation of David Hume of Godscroft has suffered from having such an illustrious bearer of the same name, but during his own lifetime there was still another David Hume, a minister, who was also an influential author and political theorist with whom he was, and even now, is still being confused. The Dictionary of National Biography gives perhaps best evidence of this by combining the two in the person of Hume of Godscroft. One can understand why after 1594 he always used Godscroft or its Latin form, Theagrius. Even so it makes research more problematic than usual: one has to be sure which is being referred to. Just how much of a red herring exists in the other David Hume can be deduced from the fact that they were both similar in age, came from the south east of Scotland, were identified with the Calvinist/presbyterian faction in religion and politics and produced books and statements on religion and politics.

It would be as well in the first instance to dispose of this other David Hume. In the frontispiece of one of his books<sup>1</sup> he is described as 'of Dunbar' and can probably be identified with the branch of the Hume family

which came to hold the title earl of Dunbar after loyal service to James as Master of the Wardrobe. This other David Hume was in regular correspondence with James and was engaged by him to resolve the dispute between Tilenus and Du Moulin, and indeed to unify the Protestant division in France.<sup>2</sup> A minister, from 1604 he spent much of his working life in Duras, wrote Le Contr' Assassin, a diatribe against the Jesuits which nonetheless contains a very profound and detailed knowledge of French history, along with other publications of a distinctly Protestant nature. He returned to London in 1614 to report on the Du Moulin controversy,<sup>3</sup> going back to France for the Soissons Conference which he reported to James.<sup>4</sup> In 1618 he moved to Gergeau and thence to Chilleurs in 1623. However in 1634 as a foreigner he was obliged to give up his charge. Like Godscroft, the years of his birth and death are not known. But the confusion between the two is not just confined to this side of the Channel: the minister of Duras is accorded authorship of all Godscroft's works.<sup>5</sup>

In the words of Professor Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's Introduction to Plato<sup>6</sup> it is through an author's works that we get to know him. This is certainly the case with Godscroft but unfortunately he does not supply as many facts as one would wish. One can only deduce that he was born in 1558 from the Poemata Omnia in which his son states that in 1629 he was aged 71.<sup>7</sup> Again one can only



deduce the approximate date of his death from existing documents showing that he was deceased by 4th April 1631.<sup>8</sup> However his De Familia Humiae Wedderburnensi (henceforth referred to as the Family History) is the obvious source for the early part of his life, putting him in his setting as the younger son of a Border laird who 'although he did not add to his patrimony did not diminish it'. His father was involved in the civil war, first fighting on the side of Mary 'as his prince' and was so much a man of honour that, subsequently, he would not take part in opposition to her, instead sending troops under the command of a relative.<sup>9</sup> His father's familiarity with Scripture is quoted and his love of children but essentially he was a man of action in full accordance with the Border tradition. It was, however, when David's mother, Isobel Johnston, died and his father remarried that the happy family life was disrupted. The upshot was, according to David, that the children were kept very short of money, and instead of a private tutor being engaged, they received their earliest education at the home of their maternal grandparent under the tutelage of a John Knox, where the emphasis was on Latin and scripture. After that it was Dunbar Grammar where the celebrated Andrew Simson made him the Latin scholar and poet he later became. Simson's regime was not untypical when one compares it with that experienced by James Melville<sup>10</sup> or that which obtained in Buchanan's school in

Paris. Nonetheless David would appear to have been a favoured student whose efforts could change the teacher's expression from anger to pleasure.<sup>11</sup> The fact that David addressed four elegies to him shows how much he considered him responsible for his subsequent Latin facility and his considerable scholarship. Most noticeable is the fact that his brother had a different kind of education, that appropriate for an eldest son, being educated along with the young earl of Angus at court during the Morton regency.

The fact that David Hume is generally described as 'Mr' would denote university education, and certainly the name appears in the matriculation rolls of St Leonard's College in St Andrews in 1578.<sup>12</sup> Education meant much to him and there are repeated references to it in his writing: he refers to the practice among the nobility of looking down on academic education as being unnecessary for people of rank and he is quite bitter when he says it was considered appropriate only for those who had to earn a living.<sup>13</sup> As was generally the custom at this time, Hume's education was rounded off with a study visit to Europe and this was undertaken in the company of James Haldane of Gleneagles whose lifelong friend he was. It was also, however, means of getting away from a disappointed relationship.

He had entertained romantic feelings towards Jean Haldane but his brother George also wanted to marry her. George, having first ascertained from David that her honour was unbesmirched, married her with David's goodwill for as he himself states he could not provide for her as well as his brother could. The marriage took place in January 1578 and a short time afterwards David went off to France where he was 'maintained quite generously for a time'. He intended to go to Italy, probably to Padua as that was where James Haldane enrolled<sup>14</sup> as a student of languages and theology in the recently liberated university and David had got as far as Geneva when he was recalled by his brother. George, using the mediation of his uncle, stated that David should shoulder his share of the burden of running the estate - 'it was his duty and to be put before private study'. More significantly he threatened to send him no more money. In 1579 George was made warden of the Eastern Marches<sup>15</sup> and this, although a prestigious appointment, was likely to add to the pressure upon him. Needless to say David returned at once, although he had been enthralled with his studies.

It is significant that Geneva was on his itinerary, and both he and James are on the matriculation rolls.<sup>16</sup> This was the obvious Mecca for students of the new reformed religion and it is very likely that there he

heard Beza lecture, Beza whom he refers to as 'my Beza',<sup>17</sup> the possessive suggesting more than just acquaintance through his works.

However, no sooner had he returned to Scotland as he says significantly, about the same time as Esmé Stewart<sup>18</sup> came back from France, than he was embroiled not just in the day to day settlement of estate business and local feuds, but in the national politics of the day: the downfall of Morton concomitant with the rise of Lennox. It was inevitable that the Humes of Wedderburn would be involved, as he states, on account of George's relationship with the Douglasses both in terms of blood and friendship - 'he was always a partner in the troubles of that house',<sup>19</sup> and of course Archibald confided in him, 'a man whose loyalty and wisdom could be trusted above all'. They conspired to attempt to free Morton and the upshot was the charge of high treason against George. There is no doubt that David was at the sharp end of the political action of the day and this renders his writing all the more important. He could not fail to have been aware that his brother's life was at stake and acted as his agent, and he makes it quite clear that the role he played and the advice he gave were the means of saving his brother. But it was very much a case of living through extremely dangerous times, and one is left with the impression of the old nobility being able to do little to overcome the influence of Lennox and Arran, try

as they might. As well as emphasising in his Histories the significance of kin, Hume repeatedly underlines the importance of the old nobility as the pillar of society and the body politic and its role in continuing the struggle against Lennox and Arran. The unquantifiable dimensions were the roles of religion and of foreign relations.

The Catholicism of Lennox inevitably made him suspect despite the Negative Confession and there was the fear that he would be instrumental in causing a restoration of Mary as joint ruler with her son, a solution which Elizabeth was said to favour;<sup>20</sup> after all she was entertaining the prospect of marriage to Alençon as a counterbalance, a suggestion which was dropped only when she realised the popular opposition to it.<sup>21</sup> A Franco-Scottish-English bloc would make political sense as a means of countering Spain. It was, however, Walsingham and the radical puritan faction in England who laboured to disabuse Elizabeth of this idea.

When Angus, destabilised with the fall of his uncle, betook himself to the English court he was, as to be expected, entertained by the Protestant left and, according to Hume, made the acquaintance of Sir Philip Sidney who was to have a significant role in the not too distant future. Despite repeated pleas for money to support a coup, Angus was given nothing: not surprisingly since Elizabeth had spent £10,000 to no avail trying to

save Morton.<sup>22</sup> It was thus left to the friends of Angus and the like-minded native nobility to react. After all if Morton could be charged with being 'art and part' in the murder of Darnley there were others who could be charged similarly.<sup>23</sup> In the resulting Ruthven Raid both George and David took part and there is a graphic description of David's action in his History of the House of Douglas and Angus.<sup>24</sup> It is significant that he points out the ties of kin: George was not just related to Angus, he was through his marriage part of the Mar camp and as far as Angus himself was concerned 'Gowry and Glamis were come of his home, Oliphant was of his alliance having married Margaret Douglas daughter to William of Lochleven and Mar was his brother in law'.<sup>25</sup> The Raid took place in August '82 and it saw the return of Angus soon after. It was at this point that David became his servitor. Angus's sojourn in England probably made him aware of the importance of education and what was to be gained from having such a person as David Hume as his companion and secretary. There must also have been an element of gratitude for his part in the Raid and it is worth noting Bowes' comment to Walsingham: 'Albeit this accion hath bene enterprised by these noble men deservinge grett honor and prayse for their good partes therein, yett the cheife devise and execution have comed from meaner persons'.<sup>26</sup>

It is from this time that Hume appears as witness to certain Angus documents. One of these gives an interesting insight into relationships: in a dispute<sup>27</sup> between Lord Hume and the earl of Angus settlement was by pronouncement of neutral friends, William Douglas of Lochleven for Angus and George Hume of Wedderburn for Lord Hume - even though his brother was in the employ of Angus and he himself was the friend of Angus, Lord Hume was his chief. The result, which one would have expected to be unduly weighted in favour of Angus, was remarkably fair.

When the Ruthven regime, doomed according to Hume on account of disagreement between Gowrie and Pitcairn, ended with the king's 'escape', the restored Arran government sent Angus first beyond the Forth and then the Spey. David Hume accompanied him and was, on his own admission sent to ascertain Gowrie's state of mind when he was suspected of playing a double game.<sup>28</sup> Indeed it was Hume who convinced Angus that Gowrie was genuine which was the decisive factor in orchestrating the seizure of Stirling Castle. In view of the outcome it is commendable that he made no attempt to excuse his decision.

It is significant that in the Declaration which the Lords made to justify their action the main complaint was Arran's tyranny, which perverted the people from their prince and vice versa. Knowing as one does the very

definite views Hume had on tyranny and the virtuous prince, one can see his hand in the drafting of the Declaration. It is worth noting that religion was not the reason because, although Angus and his servitor were positively Protestant, there were others in the group who were not, a group described as 'an odd coalition of committed radical Protestants, dissidents with a chequered past and even some ex-Marians'.<sup>29</sup> But the trump card lay with Arran in the shape of Gowrie. His capture had the effect of confusing the issue and discouraging support as Hume states; even his brother, who was most favourably disposed and previously one of the main actors to the extent of being warded in Doune Castle, could easily have escaped and joined them, but chose not to do so.<sup>30</sup> In the event no one was convinced of their credibility. With hindsight they felt they should have acted independently without Gowrie and others: to quote Colville, 'gif thai had only convenit thair awin frendis, thai had bein sufficient party to haif rencontrit the King and all his companie bot thai thoct it to muche wythout concurrence of other nobill men for thame allone to tak so gret ane work in hand'.<sup>31</sup> They had played for high stakes and lost, now their only option was flight. Berwick was the obvious place where they would be safe, and be at the same time ready to act, when the occasion demanded.



Angus, already familiar with the English court, knew he would have the support of Walsingham, Leicester and Sidney but the Queen was another matter. There was no doubt that they were the English party in Scotland but she preferred not to support rebels openly and after all had given them precious little support recently.<sup>32</sup> In fact she did not like to commit herself unless absolutely necessary and so she kept open negotiations with Arran. Amidst the confusion of a spy system that was among the most effective of its day<sup>33</sup> it is possible to detect two distinct threads running through the period: the Walsingham/ Colville/distressed lords axis and the Hundson/Arran/Elizabeth axis, although at one point they both merged when Walsingham was the ambassador in Scotland. One feels he must have volunteered for the job.

The extent to which Elizabeth was influenced by Arran showed itself when the lords were moved to Newcastle to be less of a 'thorn in the foot'<sup>34</sup> according to Hume. The order for their removal on 11th May was enough to produce a statement from them, on 19th May to Walsingham and on 21st May to Colville, the first to point out to the Queen that 'they are suffering in ane caus quhairin hir Majeste has so gret intres and tending so much to the unquietnes of hir estait',<sup>35</sup> the other to tell the Queen that what they are engaged on is the same as the earls of Murray and Morton 'interprysit about seventeen yeris ago

for mentenance of trew religion, preservation of the King their soverene and continuance of amitie betwix the two Crownes .... For the self same men that was ledaris of our Soverene's Mother to persecut religion under pretence of civile causes ... are now croppin in about the King moving him to persecut Religion in the self same sort under pretext of civile causes'.<sup>36</sup> The letter ends in a note of desperation as the lords obviously thought they were losing their grip and in danger of being no longer in control of the situation, by trying to assure the Queen that 'thair was never so mony malcontentit in Scotland at one tyme nor moir redy to joyin togidder quhen occasion can be presentit'. It is interesting to note that religion was described as the main motive. One could say cynically that this was an attempt to win Elizabeth's favour but it is only fair to state that the flight of the ministers to Berwick after the Black Acts made a considerable impression on Angus at least, who invited James Melville to organise a regimen of religion for the exiles in Newcastle.<sup>37</sup> That was a regimen of which Calvin himself would have been proud, and Hume reports that Angus spent much of his income on maintaining the ministers. Although the ministers had belatedly lent their support to the Ruthven Raid they took great pains to point out they were no part of the seizure of Stirling. It was, of course, the Black Acts that forced their hand and it is worth noting that James

Melville had no intention of leaving with the other ministers but only did so on realising the danger of his position after his papers were searched in his absence.<sup>38</sup> A measure of the suspicion the ministers had of the lords is indicated by Melville's reaction to Angus's invitation to preach. He made excuses initially but confides in his Diary: 'the treuthe was also that my hart abhorrit and fearit to haiff to do with Angus and Mar being the Kings rebelles and nocht knowing thir cause weill and disposition of ther hart'.<sup>39</sup> Even so, in the Exhortation describing the regimen he finally devised for them he refers to them as the 'Godlie and Noble men of Scotland',<sup>40</sup> explaining their sojourn in England as for the guid cause of God's kirk, thair King and countrey', religion being the priority. Angus emerges as 'gud, godly, wyse and stout'.

This was the environment in which Hume found himself. But increasing dissatisfaction with Colville and the worry that he did not seem to be achieving anything manifested itself. It was felt that he had been encouraging them with promises of help which did not materialise,<sup>41</sup> although there was nothing new in that, and of course there was the underlying suspicion of someone who had given up the ministry to become a spy.<sup>42</sup> The net result was that Hume went south, ostensibly to pursue his studies. (As a young man of action perhaps the restrictions of the godly regimen were somewhat

irksome). But, as he himself states, Angus made use of him to forward their cause and, as was so often the case, devised a code for corresponding which would be exclusive to themselves.<sup>43</sup> Even during Hume's lifetime only two of these letters survived and are included in the History of the House of Douglas and Angus.<sup>44</sup> Regrettably the dangerous nature of the times meant it was safer to destroy the evidence if one could not communicate in person.

While in London Hume associated with the ministers, who were already there - after all James Lawson and Andrew Melville were personal friends. But he also mixed with the Protestant court circle. Just how he managed to insinuate himself can be deduced from the two letters mentioned above; in the first he was looking for an opportunity to visit Mr Secretary Walsingham and in the second of March 84/85 he is obviously au fait with the court scene and well known to Philip Sidney. That is hardly surprising, since Buchanan had been in regular contact if not with Sidney himself, certainly with his circle between 1578 and 1582, and the publication of his De Jure in 1579 was due to Daniel Rogers<sup>45</sup> one of this circle, where it obviously became a matter of great interest and Walsingham was able to quote it to James in 1583. The group of Leicester, Sidney, Walsingham, Randolph, Rogers, Spenser Harvey and Dyer were seen to have 'interlocking religious political and literary

interests' and agreement on a number of points is a feature of the group 'which taken together form a pattern of thinking and feeling that is unique in the period'.<sup>46</sup> In many ways Hume was the heir of Buchanan<sup>47</sup> and as such would be a part of this circle. However, as a second son of a laird he did not have the independent means or wealthy connections of this group and one is inclined to think that his poems addressed to Elizabeth, Walsingham and Cecil were an attempt to gain patronage or recognition.

But the role of Sidney was of considerable significance. As Walsingham was to state, 'The poor earl of Angus and earl of Mar receive here little comfort otherwise than from poor Sir Philip Sidney',<sup>48</sup> and went on to say that the whole burden of entertaining the Scottish lords would fall on Sidney.<sup>49</sup> Moreover when the Master of Gray made animadversions against the lords, accusing them of conspiracy against the King, to the extent that Elizabeth yielded to the request of moving them further south, it was David Hume and Philip Sidney who advised them. Oxford or Cambridge was first suggested but in fact it was Norwich that they moved to in February 1585 to remain a month before they were brought to London to answer their charges; Hume suggests that the affair was a charade<sup>50</sup> which had to be gone through to exonerate them, but at the same time to satisfy the court party in Scotland. The Master of Gray playing both ends against

the middle was to use this very ruse to destroy Arran and, quite remarkably collect some money from England at the same time.<sup>51</sup> But it was Hume and Sidney who instructed the lords in the roles they had to adopt and how to petition the Queen.<sup>52</sup> It worked as planned and by November the lords and some of the ministers with whom they had joined up in London returned to Stirling which they took without difficulty but with the loss of Hume's lifelong friend James Haldane.

There is no doubt that Hume was disappointed that Angus did not take a position in the new government. He even remonstrated with him, and there was a certain dissatisfaction among the ministers that the new regime did not introduce 'the right Form' of church government<sup>53</sup> and went along with the King's episcopal preference. 'Toleration of that unlawful Office' was a main criticism, and although Angus was considered 'the best affected of all the nobilitie to the weale both of kirk and common weale' the others were blamed 'for being too carefull for their owne particular',<sup>54</sup> and more concerned about restitution of their property. The rest 'made it now seene that they were not so carefull of the weale of the countrie as they pretended',<sup>55</sup> and to some extent Angus was criticised for not pushing the matter: the initial reservations that the ministers had entertained about the Ruthven raiders re-emerged. Angus's explanation was that they did not want to antagonise the



monarch and would make the appropriate changes by degrees.<sup>56</sup> However Angus survived the restitution by only two years but rewarded his 'well beloved servitor Mr David Hume' in recognition of his 'guid trew and thankfull service done to us in tyme bygane' and to help him 'to continew thairin in tyme coming' with the tack of the lands and steading of Wester Brokholis in Boncle for nineteen years.<sup>57</sup>

With the death of Angus in 1588, life became more settled for David Hume and he resorted to his Border life and to helping his brother with his administration. This, however, was to be the period for him of literary production and public statements. In 1589 he, along with many others throughout the country, became a commissioner,<sup>58</sup> specially created to guard the country against Jesuits. Although the Armada had been defeated the Spanish threat was not over: in February 1589 letters had been intercepted in England showing Huntly's support for Spain, a precursor of the affair of the Spanish blanks. But, as is pointed out by Graves Law, 'A discoverie of the unnatural and traiterous conspiracie of the Scottish papists' published in 1593 emphasises the importance of the letters of 1589 rather than the Spanish blanks.<sup>59</sup> This anti-Catholic legislation is seen as bargaining on the part of the King<sup>60</sup> and although the Commission emphasises the anti-Jesuit role it should be remembered the other peace-keeping and social roles that

he fulfilled at this time as a J.P.<sup>61</sup> There is no evidence of Hume hauling suspected Jesuits before an assize or besieging them in their refuges and he omits any reference to this in his Family History. Rather in this period he was engaged in legal disputes and score settling. There is a case between him and the tenants of Lord Hume and he was heavily involved in assisting his brother in the settlement of the John Ker of Hirsell episode which he describes in detail in the Family History:<sup>62</sup> since Ker, their brother in law, had abandoned his wife in favour of the wife of Hamilton of Innerwick, as well as wanting it to be treated as a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, they wanted the return of Spylaw and Graden, her marriage portion. Not surprisingly this resulted in a mini-war between the two families, but the matter was settled on 7th February 1594.<sup>63</sup>

It was obviously about this time that Hume thought of settling down and marrying, preparing the way for marriage by the acquisition of some land and income. In January '93/4 George assigned him the teinds of Darnchester for nineteen years, David having power 'to make security upon these for the liferent of his future spouse whomsoever he shall happen to marry'.<sup>64</sup> In August of the same year his brother John disposed to him the lands of 'Goddescroft and Lukascheill' and Barbara Johnstone is referred to as his future spouse.<sup>65</sup> After



relinquishing Jean Haldane to his brother and returning from Europe he must have made overtures to Barbara Johnstone because in his poems addressed to her he says that their marriage was postponed fourteen years. Also in Poemata Omnia is a passage by the 'bereaved orphans'<sup>66</sup> describing their parents' love. Though she had been madly in love with David Hume, 'and although Andrew Melville and James Lawson and other holy and learned men made entreaties', her father would not give his consent. He obviously felt that his daughter could do better than marry a penniless younger son. She stayed at home for seven years and then at her father's bidding married John Haldane, brother of David's friend but significantly the eldest son. John Haldane was a widower who had previously been married to David's sister Isobel, 'the best friend of Barbara and it is said she married with David's goodwill. It all seems rather incestuous,<sup>67</sup> but although this sort of intermarrying of kin makes research complicated it does illustrate the strength of kin ties. John died eighteen months later leaving her with a daughter, Lylia, and pregnant with the second, Martha. After the birth she went home to her father and remained with him four years. Although her love of David was renewed, her father was no less antagonistic. Doubtless David's involvement in the Ruthven Raid and subsequent exile were factors as well as his landless state - hence the acquisition of Godscroft and Lowkieschil. According

to the children her father finally relented and they married in 1594, a marriage which lasted 36 years during which they had seven children; two of them died in infancy, but four sons and a daughter survived to adulthood.

The eldest son, Aselcane, was the subject of several poems by his father, and there is a short poem about daughter Anna. Aselcane who appears several times as a witness (sometimes described as Asserchane) predeceased his father, dying in 1629, the same year as his mother, and being buried at Abbey St Bathans.<sup>68</sup> John is described as the eldest son in March 1632<sup>69</sup> and became a minister. He it was who, along with his sister, was responsible for the publication of the History of the House of Douglas and Angus. James became known as a mathematician, publishing several treatises in Paris<sup>70</sup> and was responsible for the posthumous publication of his father's poetry,<sup>71</sup> together with his own. He gave himself the title Theagrius after the death of his father, probably only too aware of the profusion of Humes and the likelihood of mistaken identity. He may also have been part of the Napier circle of scientific discovery.<sup>72</sup> There is a reference to Erchie, son of David Hume of Godscroft in connection with a bond in 1620.<sup>73</sup> This may be the fourth son, or may be an abbreviation for Aselcane/Asserchane, a name which must have caused some problem for clerks. The family were all

educated to a high level as one would expect and a pedagogue was employed by the name of Scharp.<sup>74</sup> A love of books was obviously a family characteristic as there is a bill for books amounting to £3,901-16-8 owed by George in 1605.<sup>75</sup>

Mismanagement of money was another family characteristic. From the time that George became involved with the royal household, the solid financial foundation of the Humes of Wedderburn was undercut. As early as 1596 he was aware of malicious gossip and accusations to the extent that he got George Hume of Spot, later earl of Dunbar, to speak for him to the King and there is a letter of reassurance from him.<sup>76</sup> The accusations were 'nocht mett to be pwt in wreyth' but David in the poem addressed to him after his death<sup>77</sup> says that he was accused of peculation. But he went on to become Comptroller of the Household in 1598. Was this James taking advantage of his vulnerability? At any rate the task was too much for him and he was forced to provide for the royal household from revenues that were painfully inadequate. Despite agreement from the king to meet 'superexpensis', it was an impossible situation with him using his own money for the benefit of the king. He tried to extricate himself from the commitment using his brother David and John Johnstone, an Edinburgh burgess, to plead for him, arguing among other things the deployment of moneys underwritten for the furnishing of

the household being put to other use, not getting expected annuities and being 'damnifent in the upcrying of the money'. But all to no avail: he was not released from the bond and so absconded, but bills relating to that year pursued him virtually to the end of his life. There is a memo from 1663 which states that since the King was considerably in George's debt his son Sir David petitioned Charles in 1633, whose treasurer investigated and 'having examined the accompts did find that the King was oweing either about 6 or 9 thousand libra which was due to the petitioner about 30 years agoe quharof he had neither principall nor annual rents'.<sup>78</sup> Needless to say the money was never repaid.

From this time on there is evidence of unpaid bills: in 1609 David witnessed an acquittance to George for fees for the years 1597 and 1598;<sup>79</sup> similarly in 1613 an acquittance acknowledging £200 from George as the balance of fees to one of the ministers of the King's household<sup>80</sup> in 1597 and 1598. In 1620 David disponded Godscroft and Lowkiescheill and Wester Brokholes, with their tacks of the teind sheaves of Darnchester and an annual rent of 1400 merks, to his nephew in return for his becoming cautioner for David and his wife for certain sums of money, the writs to be returned and the lands renounced as soon as the money was paid.<sup>81</sup> But it never was. And so when David died his family did not get possession of Godscroft and there is a formal renunciation by John in

favour of Mary Hume, lady Arniston in March 1632:<sup>82</sup> Sir David retaining possession gifted it to his sister. There is also reference to the escheat goods of the deceased David Hume of Godscroft in connection with a debt of £492 in April 1631.<sup>83</sup> But as has been remarked by Keith Brown, the price rise in Scotland was a generation later than in the rest of Europe and the increase in taxation from 1607 did not help. His statement, 'By the 1620s many landowners were heavily in debt to merchant creditors who often had possession of their mortgaged estates'<sup>84</sup> does seem to be borne out by the example of Hume, although in his case it was to his nephew that he had mortgaged his property.

Apart from a few complaints,<sup>85</sup> seeking redress for wrongs,<sup>86</sup> protesting about the riding of Chirnside Common<sup>87</sup> and attending baptisms<sup>88</sup> life was relatively uneventful, the most noteworthy event being the holding of the Barony court at Godscroft. The document<sup>89</sup> that exists relates to the court being held in August 1629 two months after Hume's wife's death and certainly he emerges as a rather cantankerous old man. The first statute that 'the haill tenantes and servandis within the said baronie sall keep the preachings and haill ordoures of the Kirk' is certainly in line with the poetry he wrote at this time, deeply religious and devout. But more than that, he is ruling with a heavy hand: 'no tenant or servant to go to Strathfontain mill without leive askit and gevin

under the paine of xx shillings Scottis'; no gathering sticks without permission; and there is a table of fines for disputes, ranging from twenty shillings for flyting to £1 for drawing blood. Disobedience was fined at 13s 4d.<sup>90</sup> The impression one gets is of a rather testy old man keeping a tight rein on his servants and tenants and ensuring order and discipline according to his own standards. But if he was indeed an angry old man, he had good cause: his wife and eldest son died in the same year and in one of the poems addressed to his wife<sup>91</sup> he tells how he himself and his daughter had been struck low but remarkably had survived. When he did die is not recorded, but it is known that he was dead by 4th April 1631, as mentioned above.

It would appear that the greatest influences on Hume were his brother George, George Buchanan, Andrew Melville and James Lawson. George certainly shaped his attitude to religion: there is reference in the Family History to his brother translating the Latin mass only to ridicule it,<sup>92</sup> and his attitude to religion was in turn shaped by Angus, his companion, and his education at Morton's court. Morton's sojourn in England created a knowledge of, and sympathy for, matters English and he was identified with the pro-English party in Scotland. This in turn affected his nephew. It has been said 'that 1560 saw the beginning of what has been described as the better understanding between England and Scotland'.<sup>93</sup>



Although Scotland by no means immediately became Protestant, the denial of papacy meant that from that time there would be much in common between the countries, and pro-English and Protestant became to some extent synonymous.

Another great influence was George Buchanan, who, as the intellectual of European renown, was bound to attract the interest of a keen young mind. His humanism was emulated by Hume and in many respects Hume took on his humanist mantle. Buchanan too was Protestant and pro-England in sympathy.

As for Andrew Melville he was his lifelong correspondent and friend and, although a 'forward' Protestant, he was not as immediately pro-English as European; his spiritual home lay in the Geneva of Beza. Hume had great respect for his opinion and consulted him about most of his writing. In return Melville considered him one of the finest minds of his time.<sup>94</sup> He it was who spoke on Hume's behalf to his future father-in-law. Also acting as referee was James Lawson, first minister of Edinburgh from 1572 until 1584 and the most highly respected among the Presbyterian ministers with whom Hume is described as 'very intimate'.<sup>95</sup> It is significant that at his funeral in London, which was attended by an exceptional number of mourners (about 500 according to

Calderwood), Hume was first of the pall bearers after the ministers and is listed as being one of those present at his deathbed in Cheapside.

Perhaps it is remarkable that he was friends with men that were so much older than himself: it would, however, suggest his fondness for intellectual companionship.

What began as intellectual affinity became a practicality with the flight to England after the Ruthven Raid, an England where Angus already had friends and contacts. Although it may appear that the exiled lords and the ministers were mere pawns in the end game that was going on between James and Elizabeth, a united subculture had been formed between the Scottish presbyterians and the English puritans, starting most likely in 1575 with the sojourn of John Davidson and the establishment of contacts<sup>96</sup> with the Field/Davidson/Walsingham contingent that was to reach fruition in the '80s. It is significant that when the Ruthven Raiders, of which group David Hume was a part, were in control there was a positive attempt to get James to intervene on behalf of English presbyterians 'to disburden their brethren of England of the yoke of ceremonies imposed upon them'.<sup>97</sup> But it was the English exile that was to produce the strongest bonds between the exiled lords, the ministers and the English presbyterians, and Hume details the preaching facilities that were put at their disposal.



Most significantly, it was Hume who was the link and go-between. A mind such as his was obviously put to great use recording the events of these crucial years, and it is significant that when Carmichael was preparing his Apologia, along with the Confession of Faith, it was his intention to include 'David Hume's buik',<sup>98</sup> which gave an account of the four years from the return of Lennox. The significance of such an account was recognised by Carmichael who wrote to Angus about it and also to Davison. Again, the series of conversations with Angus which were subsequently included in the History of the House of Douglas and Angus show very clearly his thinking: they set forth ideas which were of crucial importance to the philosophy of the presbyterians. But this thinking, which clearly emphasises his attitude to tyranny and the right of resistance to a tyrant, was very much an extension of Buchanan's theory of the Rex Stoicus.<sup>99</sup> Similarly, his emphasis on the virtuous noble and virtuous king with restraint of passion common to both is used not just as an instruction to Angus but underlines the obligation of the old nobility as the traditional supporters and advisers of the monarch. The analogies are classical, as was to be expected; Fabius Maximus and the Fabii maintaining civic virtue. Here again one can see the continuity between the thinking that could justify the removal of Mary and later remove Charles. And so Hume was providing the link not just

between the various presbyterian elements - but he was also providing the philosophy.

A growing body of interpreters checking the Vulgate against the Hebrew and Greek had for some time been arguing that the Book of Revelations referred to the Apocalypse, and various interpretations made 1666 and 1650 significant years to look forward to.<sup>100</sup> In fact living in the latter days of the world was to be a common theme, a theme which recurs in cycles down to recent times. And the Reformation was seen as a phase in the struggle between good and evil, intensified after the Council of Trent. The monarch, as in the case of Elizabeth, could thus be seen as the Woman Clothed with the Sun in opposition to the whore of Babylon or, as in the case of James, as the new Constantine. Awareness of the Apocalypse was everyday. Hume mentioned it as one of the topics discussed by his brother<sup>101</sup> although he does not pronounce on it, and Buchanan in the poem 'Calendae Maiae' referred to it.

Forsan supremis cum Deus ignibus  
 Piabit orbem (ll. 25-26)  
 (Perhaps when God sanctifies the world  
 with the final fires)

The union of 1603 was thus seen as the fulfilment of so many prophecies. 'At that moment apocalyptic enthusiasm for Great Britain and the new emperor lately risen knew scarcely any bounds'<sup>102</sup> and none more so than James believing his own publicity and having his own

apocalyptic writings reprinted. This was the time when Hume was naive enough to believe in Scottish dominance. Although he was a firm believer in Great Britain, he was first and foremost a Scot as can be seen in all his writing. About Hume's masque *Daphn-Amaryllys*, Andrew Melville commented to him about the significance of Daphne's name coming first and in the *De Unione* there is voiced the prospect of equality and equal representation. Although his first tract on the subject, to which few could take exception, was published in 1604, the second which was more extreme was not published even in France where his namesake described it as having 'no urther end then to make Scotland equal to England in all and superior in some pointis'.<sup>103</sup> Fortunately the manuscript still exists. In it Hume has worked out just what was to merge and why it was necessary, ranging from 'Symbolum et Insignia' to the 'Iudicia et Leges' where not surprisingly for a humanist Roman law would predominate. But most important to him was religion, because the presbyterian system was the historic symbol of Scottish liberty, the same system would have to be applied to England. This did not seem to him to be a problem, having associated for so long with Walsingham and the puritan left during his English exile. But he reckoned without James and the practicality he perceived of using bishops to maintain his position - something James had been working towards from before the Union of the

Crowns.<sup>104</sup> It only needed the enthusiasm with which he was greeted by the English clergy for him to find the church of England 'exactly to his taste'. And who in his right mind would prefer the plain-speaking and irreverence of the Scottish presbyterians - 'God's silly vassal' - to expressions of sycophantic admiration from the English churchmen who described him as 'a living Library and a walking Study'<sup>105</sup> whose words were 'Apples of gold with pictures of silver'. No wonder he referred to England as 'the promised land where Religion was purely professed'. Surely this must have been what was in mind when the Scottish parliament at Perth in 1606 was presented with the Protestation which complained about 'the falshood, flatterie and crueltie of ambitious avarice which hath brought so many notable Emperors Kings and Princes to tragicall ends'.

That history was of great significance is evident in most of Hume's work and its function in teaching and warning was used extensively by him in the humanist tradition, and this is amply shown below. But more than that it was closely related to patriotism. When John Camden produced a history which 'blasted the premises of a genuinely national Scottish consciousness, swamped the erudition through which they were articulated, savaged its leading exponent and mocked the origins of those who bore the name Scott'<sup>106</sup> it was obviously a challenge which Hume, Buchanan's intellectual heir, could not

resist. But it was not just a case of taking up cudgels on Buchanan's behalf: 'mendacem, indoctum, vanumque cerebri Camdenum bellus comprobatur iste liber' (that fine book of yours proves Camden to be a liar, ignorant and empty headed).<sup>107</sup> Although it is clear that it was almost impossible to apply reason and logic to such an obscure subject as the origin of the Scots, it is the vehemence of his rejection of Camden's viewpoint that comes across most clearly.

Like Buchanan, Hume gave his support to the thesis of the Irish origin of the Scots, but despite the apparent vehemence with which he argued the same case as the elder scholar, he could not write with the same conviction as Buchanan who as a Gaelic speaker no doubt reared on Highland legend, would give approval to the traditional ancestry of his race. Hume as a Borderer speaking as his native tongue, a language akin to English, could not identify as strongly as Buchanan with an Irish origin for the Scots but he was all too well aware of English attempts like that of Camden to deny Scottish nationhood by categorising the northern and western part of the country as inhabited by 'Scythian' barbarians and the northern part as northern English, and that opinion he was determined to refute. Yet there is no denying that two distinct cultural traditions have existed in Scotland right up to the present day. But Buchanan, the Gaelic speaker, and Hume, the Borderer, expressed a common



identity as humanists. The Latin language was common to them both and as Scottish humanists they were recognised in Europe. Any English denial was either based on ignorance of the facts of Scottish history or was prepared for specious and unscrupulous motives.

That early history and legend were inextricably linked he was only too well aware: a scientific approach was not possible. And this is apparent in the other Histories he wrote - although Solvathius and others may not have existed they were nonetheless part of tradition. Even classical history had its roots in legend. But the important factor was the connection between legend, origin, self-awareness and patriotism and this is what Hume underlined. Similarly it was this awareness of history and its importance to an autonomous culture that made Hume remonstrate so forcibly in the History of the House of Douglas and Angus about the cultural depredations of Edward I and no doubt he saw the analogy with Carthage.

It was also history which was fundamental to the bishops/presbyters controversy. Both sides appealed to the authority of history, but each gave entirely different interpretations of the role of bishops in the early history of the church and in the early days of the Reformation. At stake in all this was the principle of parity. In the epistolary debate with James Law and William Cowper, Hume used arguments that are at once

historic and humanist. Here again he is assuming the mantle not just of Buchanan and Melville but of Major too. Altogether twelve letters were written to James Law in 1608 and there were complaints when he did not get a speedy reply.<sup>108</sup> James had moved the leading churchmen down to London, ostensibly for consultation but in fact to remove them while he introduced the most controversial changes to the church in Scotland, namely the introduction of bishops. Hume was recognised as the main protagonist for the presbyterians to such an extent that again attempts were made to silence him by refusing him publication - he 'wanted the commoditie of the presse' in his reply to Cowper's Dikaiologie. What was hardest for the presbyterians to accept was the fact that Cowper had been one of the signatories of the Protestation. In the correspondence with Law and Cowper, the fundamental philosophy of the presbyterianism camp is set forth with clarity and logic: the argument that there is a hierarchy in nature is ridiculed, Cato's introduction of one man one vote, regardless of talent, is held up as the classical example, and in Ciceronian style Hume shows that 'paritie of pastors is not against the Word, not against nature, not against reason, not against order nor policie'.<sup>109</sup> Although in historical terms Hume concedes that at the time of the oath there were bishops in the church, he states 'I trow ye sall find yourself to have mistaken it... bishops then did not govern but were



governed'. But crucial to the body politic is the threat of tyranny and the fact that 'the bishops shall never admonish ... they stand by the affection of the prince',<sup>110</sup> and of course the outcome would be the destruction of liberty. Once again the example was made of the early Caesars.

How strongly Hume felt on this issue can be seen in his open letter to Patrick Simson<sup>111</sup> where he complained about lack of enthusiasm for defining truth; the Patrick Simson who said that bishops 'have trode the anointed of the Lord under their feet'. Again in Poemata Omnia one reads of an attack made on Andrew Melville by William Barclay to which Hume responded. But because it was so scathing about bishops his son considered it unwise to print, although he does indicate how Hume punned on Barclay's name.<sup>112</sup>

That Hume should be concerned with Machiavelli is not surprising. Although not published in English until 1640, Il Principe had a profound influence on political thought in Henrician and Elizabethan England and appears to have influenced James in his writing of Basilikon Doron, a manuscript copy of Il Principe having been produced by the court poet William Fowler.<sup>113</sup> James was intent on showing that he was not in fact that type of prince - he was no usurping tyrant and his survival did not depend on faction and dissension. It is significant that Hume should have written his Apologia Basilica in

1626, ostensibly, but also addressed to all the princes in the world, for the new King Charles. Just as Charles's father avoided the vices and weaknesses of Machiavelli so should Charles. Quoting from Machiavelli, Hume deals with the main points of his argument, providing his "Antithesis" to Il Principe.. What is most obvious is his reference to history and use of history to learn the lessons of the past, a theme which is recurrent in his other Histories. The lesson to be learned is that the greatest men are the ones who follow the path of virtue. The example is quoted of Pompey, who met disaster because he 'pursued power in preference to true virtue'.<sup>114</sup> How often this theme crops up in his historiography will be elaborated below. Once again emphasis is placed on classical examples and in this philosophy he is again seen to be the disciple of Buchanan who, in his History, lists the early kings of Scotland who were deposed for their tyranny. Regrettably James was not as loyal a disciple of Buchanan as Hume, although Roger Mason's assessment of James is that 'in his shrewd exploitation of his power in Scotland James demonstrated a profound sensitivity to the extent and limitation of royal authority'.<sup>115</sup> Although Hume must have been indeed disappointed at the way Scotland was relegated to a subordinate position after 1603, he continued to see himself as a Scoto-Britannus and his majesty's 'humble servant' to the end, his loyalty

unwavering and his Apologia Basilika an attempt to ensure for himself and his prince the immortality accorded to Machiavelli and his prince. This was to be another example of virtue triumphing over vice. Charles, unfortunately, did not learn the lesson of history.

Variously called 'the presbyterian hatchet man',<sup>116</sup> and 'the party's most formidable intellect',<sup>117</sup> David Hume of Godscroft was the writer who above all defined the presbyterian position and provided it with a philosophy. A younger son with all the disadvantages inherent in that position, he had made his way through his considerable ability. It is significant that Andrew Melville said of him, 'You do not canvass the praise of your intellect'.<sup>118</sup> His intellect was recognised from his schooldays but apart from using it to bridge the gap between the exiled lords and ministers it was really after his return to the Borders that he was in a position to publish his thoughts on politics and the impending union with England. As has been stated above, he could see the advantages of belonging to Great Britain but considered himself above all Scottish. His knowledge of the classics was such that he could use that knowledge in defence of every argument, but more than that he had cultivated a sophisticated style of reasoning, which is illustrated in the Ciceronian delivery of his statement to John Law about tyranny:

as in the alteratioun of the Roman government when with Julius monarchie re-entered; though the senat was yett on foote; though consuls were chosin and had name and countenance; yett the force of authoritie and governement the libertie in choice of persons restrained from free choice to the recommendatioun of the emperour and the truthe of the old estate taken away, none denyes but the governement was altered and the verie essence of it changed from popular to monarchicall.<sup>119</sup>

No wonder Law was slow to reply. But more than anything, Hume demonstrates that humanism and classical philosophy provided a basis for presbyterianism. Hume also played the role of Cassandra, able to foresee the future but unable to do anything about it, other than give the warning:

I may say as a Scottishman to you as a Scottishman (John Law) and I trust not without some regarde unto your native countrie and to whom some charge of it is given, these maters of alteratioun of discipline I take to be verie unprofitable handled for this countrie of Scotland, more unprofitable to be prosecuted and most unprofitable of all to be effectuated as a verie step which can hardlie (at least in some of his Majestie's successors) but come to a preeminence of that other countrie beyond it, yea a tyrannizing over it.

This statement encapsulates the essence of David Hume. While describing himself as Scoto Britannus, he was above all a Scot and a European humanist. Scotland, too, he identified with the presbyterian form of church government and that for him meant freedom from tyranny. Tyranny is a word he used advisedly in its classical application fully aware of all its implications. It was

a danger for any body politic but that it should be introduced from south of the border was in his view the worst kind of treachery.

## NOTES

## CHAPTER ONE

1. D Hume, Lettres et traitez chrestiens pleins d'instructions et consolations morales et saintes (Bergen, 1613); F Michel, Les Ecossais en France, (Paris, 1862), 11, 185. There was also, of course, David Hume of Coldingham one of the exiled ministers.
2. James urged 'une entière et sincère union' among all French Protestants. BL, Stowe MSS 174 no. 66 f.232.
3. Stowe MSS 174 no. 60, f.209.
4. Stowe MSS 174 nos 83 and 85ff, 306, 312, 317, 319.
5. E & E Haag, La France Protestante (Paris, 1846-59), v, 518.
6. 'Always seeking the author behind the book' - U von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Platon (Berlin, 1919), 1, 8.
7. D Hume, Poemata Omnia (Paris, 1639) [Poemata Omnia]; Jacobaea (Paris, 1639), 80.
8. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 190.
9. De Familia Humia Wedderburnensi (Abbotsford Club 1839) [Hume, De Familia], 45.
10. J Melville, Autobiography and Diary, ed. R. Pitcairn (Wodrow Society, 1842) [Melville, Diary], 14-17.
11. Poemata Omnia, Lusus Poetici Elegy 1, 15 ll. 114-116.
12. Hume, De Familia, 60.
13. D Hume, History of the House of Douglas and Angus (Edinburgh, 1644) [Hume, History], 360: 'Letters are thought onely necessary and useful for mean men who intend to live by them'.
14. A. Haldane, The Haldanes of Gleneagles (Edinburgh, 1929), 46.
15. HMC Milne Hume MSS no. 98.
16. Le Livre du Recteur de l'Académie de Genève 1559-1878, ed. S. Stelling-Michaud (Geneva, 1959), 103.



17. D Hume, Lusus Poetici (London, 1604), Elegy V, l. 309. It should be noted that in the Poemata Omnia Elegy V ends at l. 236, thus omitting the most significant part, the rejection of temptation and adoption of the Calvinist ethic.
18. Hume, De Familia, 73.
19. Hume, History, 384.
20. This was how the visit of La Motte Fenélon and Manningville was interpreted. Original letters of Mr John Colville, 1582-1603 (Bannatyne Club, 1858), 21-22; G Donaldson, Scotland: James V - VII (Edinburgh, 1965) [Donaldson, Scotland], 179.
21. Sir Philip Sidney and John Stubbs are the best known examples although George Buchanan wrote to Daniel Rogers to the same effect. The role of Sidney was not inconsiderable. He was the very articulate mouthpiece of Walsingham and his letter against the French marriage played a significant part. A Feuillerat (ed.), The Works of Sir Philip Sidney (Cambridge, 1963), 3, 51-53.
22. K. Brown, 'The Price of Friendship: The Well Affected and English Economic Clientage in Scotland before 1603' in R Mason (ed.), Scotland and England 1286-1815 (Edinburgh, 1989), 145, 153 [Brown: 'The price of friendship']. Bowes was given £2,000 'for those meetest' and £10,000 was spent reinforcing Berwick; Calendar of State Papers Scotland, v, 270 [CSP Scot].
23. Donaldson, Scotland, 178, points out the personal reasons: Gowrie having to bear the expense of the king's guard, and Glamis having been fined by Lennox; also Brown, 'The price of friendship', 146; R S Brydon, 'Finance of James VI, 1567-1603' (Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1925), 43-6.
24. Hume, History, 366.
25. Ibid., 368.
26. Original Letters of Mr John Colville, 1582-1603, 11.
27. HMC Home MSS (12th Report part VIII).
28. Hume, History, 377.
29. G Donaldson, All the Queen's Men: Power and Politics in Mary Stewart's Scotland (London, 1983), 140-3; M Lynch, Scotland: a New History (London, 1991), 232.



30. Hume, History, 384.
31. Original Letters of Mr John Colville, 1582-1603, 52.
32. Brown, 'The price of friendship', 153.
33. A Haynes, Invisible Power (London 1992).
34. Hume, History, 392.
35. Original Letters of Mr John Colville, 1582-1603, 52.
36. *Ibid.*, 53.
37. Melville, Diary, 121.
38. *Ibid.*, 117.
39. *Ibid.*, 120.
40. *Ibid.*, 121.
41. Hume, History, 393.
42. *Ibid.*, 394.
43. *Ibid.*, 394. Ciphers abound in this period: see Hamilton Papers 11, also such frustrating statements as 'I thincke it superfluous havinge so sufficient and trustie a messenger to comytt much to paper', Hamilton Papers 11, 535. Hamilton Papers, ed J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1892) [Hamilton Papers].
44. Hume, History, 395-399.
45. J E Phillips, 'George Buchanan and the Sidney circle', Huntington Library Quarterly, xii (1948-9), 24.
46. *Ibid.*, 55.
47. A Williamson, 'Calvinism, kin-ties and civic humanism', SHR, lxxii (1993), 4.
48. Hamilton Papers, ii, 523; R Howell, Sir Philip Sidney the Shepherd Knight (London, 1968), 188; M Wallace, The Life of Sir Philip Sidney (Cambridge, 1965), 321.
49. Hamilton Papers, ii, 526.
50. Hume, History, 400.
51. CSP Scot, xi, 58.

52. The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society (Edinburgh, 1844), 425.
53. I.e. a presbyterian form of church government. Calderwood, History of the Kirk of Scotland (Wodrow Soc., 1843) [Calderwood, History], iv, 464.
54. Ibid., iv, 465.
55. Ibid., iv, 465.
56. Hume, History.
57. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 174.
58. Calderwood, History, v, 47.
59. T Graves Law, Collected Essays and Reviews (Edinburgh, 1904), 257-9.
60. Ruth Grant gave a paper entitled 'James VI, the Sixth Earl of Huntly and the Politics of the Counter Reformation' at the Conference held in Edinburgh University, 1994, James VI: Court and Kingship. She suggested that Huntly was merely used by James.
61. Calendar of Border Papers, ii, 243-245.
62. Hume, De Familia, 78.
63. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 131.
64. Ibid., no. 129.
65. Ibid., nos. 176 and 177.
66. Poemata Omnia Lusus Poetici, 94.
67. M Meikle, 'Lairds and Gentlemen: a study of the landed families of the eastern Anglo-Scottish Borders, 1540-1603' (Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University, 1989).
68. Poemata Omnia.
69. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 191.
70. A list of James Hume's published works (eleven in all) is included at the end of Poemata Omnia together with the address where they may be purchased.
71. James Hume's poems are included along with his father's.

72. A Williamson, 'Number and national consciousness' in R Mason (ed.), Scots and Britons (Cambridge, 1994), 204-5.
73. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 190.
74. He appears as a witness, HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 169.
75. Ibid., no. 160.
76. Ibid., no. 137.
77. APS, iv, 166; RPC, v, 525; J Goodare, 'Parliament and Society in Scotland 1560-1603' (Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University, 1989), i, 203.
78. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 251.
79. Ibid., nos. 171, 172.
80. Ibid., no. 201.
81. Ibid., no. 201.
82. RDI\449.
83. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 190.
84. K. Brown, 'Aristocratic Finances and the Origins of the Scottish Revolution', (EHR, civ 1989), 74.
85. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 185.
86. Ibid., no. 188.
87. Ibid., no. 185.
88. CH 2\307, 28.
89. HMC Milne Hume MSS, no. 189.
90. To give a comparison 13/4d was a day's pay for agent Nicolson: K Brown, 'The price of friendship', 150.
91. Poemata Omnia, Lusus Poetici, 88.
92. Hume, De Familia, 61.
93. W Ferguson, Scotland's Relations with England: a Survey to 1707 (Edinburgh, 1977), 74; also Donaldson, Scotland, 41: 'In the whole period down to 1603 religion probably did more than anything else to foster the consciousness of common aims and common destiny'.

94. D Hume, De Unione Insulae Britanniae Liber seu Tractatus secundus. Advocates MSS 31.6.13 [Hume, De Unione Tractatus secundus]. Introductory letter A Melville to D Hume, 25 April 1604.
95. Hume, History, 392.
96. G Donaldson, Scottish Church History (Edinburgh, 1985), 178 et seq.
97. Ibid., 180; NLS, MS 6.1.13; BUK ii, 613-4.
98. CSP Scot, vii, 195, 208. Wodrow Miscellany, 425.
99. R Mason, 'George Buchanan, James VI and the Scottish Polity', in New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland, eds. J Dwyer, R Mason and A Murdoch (Edinburgh, 1985), 30.
100. A Williamson, 'Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain' in New Perspectives, ed. Dwyer et al. [Williamson, 'Scotland Antichrist'], 34.
101. Hume, De Familia, 61.
102. A Williamson, 'Scotland, Antichrist', 44.
103. Hume of Duras, PRO SP 14\57.
104. D. Mullan, Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of an Idea, 1560-1638 (Edinburgh, 1986), 103; D Wilson, King James VI and I (London, 1959), 197.
105. W Barlow, The summe and substance of the conference at Hampton Court January 14, 1604 (London, 1604), 84.
106. A Williamson, Scottish National consciousness in the Age of James VI (Edinburgh, 1979), 126 [Williamson, Scottish National Consciousness].
107. D Hume, 'Vindiciae Buchanani contra Camdenum' (Advocates MSS 31.6.12).
108. Calderwood, History, vii, 145.
109. Ibid., vii, 66.
110. Ibid., vi, 533.
111. Open letter to Patrick Simson: Aldis 412.3
112. Poemata Omnia, Lusus Poetici, 114.

113. R D S Jack, 'William Fowler and Italian Literature', The Modern Language Review, lxxv (1970), 40.
114. D Hume, Apologia Basilica seu Machiavelli ingenium examinatum in libro quem Princeps inscripsit (Paris, 1626), Introduction.
115. R Mason, 'George Buchanan, James VI and the Scottish Polity', in New Perspectives, ed. Dwyer et al., 30.
116. Mullan, Episcopacy, 163.
117. Williamson, Scottish National Consciousness, 89.
118. Hume, De Unione Tractatus secundus, Introductory letter from A Melville to D Hume.
119. Calderwood, History, vi, 730.

## CHAPTER TWO

THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF DOUGLAS: THE MANUSCRIPT  
AND THE 1644 EDITION

There is little doubt that David Hume of Godscroft's greatest claim to fame is as the author of The History of the House of Douglas and Angus, a history authorised by the Earl of Angus as a result of a request by James VI. Reference is made in the Dedication to William, earl of Angus 'first delineaments were drawn by my lord your honour's father at the express command of his king our much honoured late sovereign' and he describes it as 'an obliged dutie as depending from others to whome my labours and my life doe owe all lawful obedience'.

It has been generally assumed that this work was completed within five years of the author's death, certainly after 1625 and before 1631, the date of the licence to print by the Archbishop of St Andrews, and was first published in 1644 by Evan Tyler, edited by Hume's daughter Anna and published at her own and her brother's expense. The Marquis of Douglas and his son Archibald, having taken exception to the publication, obtained an interdict against its publication and sale which lasted for two years. After this subsequent printed editions never managed to make it a best seller.

However, closer examination of 'Mr David's Historie' shows a bewildering range of revisions both in manuscript and print and what is in fact the 'trew richt coppie'<sup>1</sup> is



by no means clear. To date there appears to be four manuscripts, two of the Douglas family history solely, one of the House of Angus and one of both Douglas and Angus. The only manuscript of the House of Douglas and Angus is the one from Hamilton Palace belonging to the Duke of Hamilton, now on temporary loan at West Register House.<sup>2</sup> This manuscript hereafter referred to as the Hamilton MS<sup>3</sup> is a large untidy book containing several sections bound or stitched together, written in several hands with insertions, paste overs and later additions, containing references found nowhere else. The manuscript of the House of Angus is a copy of the book in which it is written, but a copy in one hand only of all the material in the second half of the Hamilton manuscript plus what has been lost or deliberately omitted from this version, viz. William successor to Archibald, eighth earl of Angus. 'The Origine and Descent of the most noble and illustrious familie and name of Douglas: concerning their lyfes and valerous acts of armes for the defence and glorie of the Crown of Scotland'<sup>4</sup> is the title of the manuscript now in the National Library of Scotland, which although undated is written in the one hand with a few insertions and alterations in a different hand. The fourth manuscript entitled 'David Hume's Lives of the Illustrious and Renowned Familye and Name of Douglas' cannot be commented on since its whereabouts is not known, the last reference



to it being an entry in a sale catalogue of books belonging to Lord Belhaven in 1873. It is obviously different from the others since it contains a 'Note to the Reader for the Press' and a copy of the Earle of Douglas' 'Forfeittarie'. But the other three manuscripts bear a close resemblance to each other in content, style and language.

Similarly, the printed editions can be grouped together with one exception. The History of the Houses of Douglas and Angus printed by Evan Tyler in Edinburgh in 1644 is identical in content to The History of the Houses of Douglas and Angus wherein are discovered the most memorable passages of the Kingdom of Scotland from the year 767 to the Reign of our late Sovereign Lord King James the Sixth, printed by Evan Tyler in Edinburgh to be sold by TW at the Kings Arms in Paul's Churchyard London 1648 - despite the fact that the narrative ends in 1588 with the death of Archibald, eighth earl of Angus. Again, A Generall History of Scotland Together with a Particular History of the Houses of Douglas and Angus printed in Edinburgh by Evan Tyler, but with no date, differs only in the omission of one line in the middle of page 19. A General History of Scotland from the year 767 to the Death of King James printed for Simon Miller at the Starr in St Paul's Churchyard 1657 differs only in a minor detail: a curtailed conclusion of the address of the author to the reader. The variety of titles on

these publications were in fact all attempts to increase sales by putting old wine in a variety of new bottles with no scruples about false description. The eighteenth-century publication, however, returns to reality with no false claims or false advertisement, with Ruddiman's publication in 1743 of The History of the House and Race of Douglas and Angus written by Mr David Hume of Godscroft. In this period of Jacobitism, obviously a nationalistic work of this nature had a certain attraction and a list of subscribers is included in many copies of this work, the first half of which was reprinted in 1820. All these editions can be grouped together being textually virtually the same: the main difference between the 1644 and later editions being the spelling of places and names, e.g. Aire, Faw Kirk, Cardrois, Orleance and Hierusalem, Boide Creighton and Daulphin with the occasional word change, e.g. 'meales' becomes 'rents', 'birks' becomes 'birches', 'fray' becomes 'umbrage' and 'vallats' becomes 'valets'.

However, the one exception to the printed editions is that described by G P Johnston in 1902<sup>5</sup> as belonging to Mr Scott of Halkshill, a volume virtually identical to the National Library manuscript, consisting of 240 pages of the Douglas history which he argues, because of the ornaments and tailpiece, to have come from the press of Andrew Hart's heirs which stopped printing in 1639. Johnston maintains this book was printed probably between

1631 and 1634 when Sir George Douglas of Mordington, Hume's literary executor, died. It is likely that this first edition was produced in the first half of 1633 and for a very particular reason. In a letter addressed to King Charles in the Hamilton manuscript George Douglas of Mordington states:

It may please your Majesty this learned gentleman the author of this book, haveing often in his life tyme and but a few dayes before his death earnestlie entreated (nay coniured) me by our long continued friendship and education together, and for my own names sake, not to suffer this birth (for bringing foorth whereof he had beene in labour soe manie painfull yeares), to perish and be smothered in the cradle; which vehement desire of the dead and last testimonie of his lone and confidence in me, I have been exceeding loth to disappoint: Therefore after diligent peruseing of the same I have by the good assistance of a personnage of speciall note, and chiefly interested in the bussiness done my best to bring it thus to light.

This would certainly suggest printing before Mordington's death in 1634. As well as a dedication to William earle of Angus signed 'your honour's humble and obedient servant D M', the National Library manuscript carries a letter of dedication to King Charles referring to the role of David Hume in informing 'his Majestie of the true originall descent and pedegree of the house of Douglas and Anguss', how his father had drawn 'with his owne hand the first delineamentis, instructions and noates for the penning of this present historie: and thereafter by recommending the more painefull parte of the exact searching and setting down particulars by waye of our historicall narration until the care and industrie of

this honest and learned gentleman whose name is prifixed to the work'. Obviously satisfied with the result he refers to Hume as 'having now acquitted himself of that charge which well befitted a faithfull and unpartiall wryter' and goes on to ask his Majesty 'to cast a favourable eye upon these true memoriallis of these your princely progenitouris'. This letter, written in what is recognisable as Angus' own hand is signed 'Angus' - he became Marquis of Douglas 7 June 1633, which would indicate it was written before that date. These references to the true original descent and pedigree of the House of Douglas and Angus certainly tie in with the title of the work as in the National Library manuscript, 'The Origin' etc.

But even more significant, there is along with a corrected copy of this letter in the Hamilton Manuscript a separate piece of paper, heavily scored out in places which appears to be a rough draft of a letter.<sup>6</sup> It refers to an offer of King James to make Douglas, duke of Douglas at the time of the baptism of the Duke of Rothesay in 1594 and then of the present King in 1600 and how the late earl refused until he would get the ancient rights of the earls of Douglas. It also mentions how Henry VI of England had promised George, 4th earl of Angus if he helped him against Edward IV he would give him 3000 marks and the title Duke, but did not keep the bargain. King James VI, acknowledging himself successor



to Henry, had promised to wait for a suitable opportunity to remedy this 'touching which no suitable instance hath been made as yet for performing'. It continues, 'It is thought by all men of worth and knowledge that his gracious Majesty soe well affected of himself to that house will not be sparing of his royall favours for considering the honour and diginitie thereof and restoring them to their ancient luster and privileges which hardly can be done except by charging them with the title of some further honour or office of preferment'. Although this letter may never have been sent it certainly shows the way the writer's mind was working. Most likely the intention was to prepare a manuscript for printing to be printed before King Charles's visit to Edinburgh in 1633, perhaps to present him with a copy. What more suitable instance for acknowledging the merits, royal connections and obligations due to the House of Douglas by the Stewarts? If this was so it had the desired result since on that occasion Angus was created Marquis of Douglas.

And there matters may have rested but for the appearance in 1644 of the Tyler edition printed under the auspices of Anna and John Hume, the author's children. A dedication to Archibald, lord of Angus in one of the 1644 copies gives the reason for this: 'I have found this piece amongst my Father's scattered papers; it is here in his own method, without additon or change, I cannot say

without defect; for the Dedication is lost and a new one being necessary there is none to whom the patronage as properly belongs as your Lordship'. The words 'scattered papers' and 'the Dedication is lost' may be significant. Since the actual manuscript that Anna Hume used is not extant as far as is known, it is possible that she has put together and edited an abstract or draft made by her father along with letters to the ninth earl, or for that matter may have edited a copy her father made for himself. It is only by careful comparison of the printed text with the only complete manuscript, the Hamilton manuscript, that one can surmise at the true authorship of both. Certain it is that Anna Hume got an unexpected reaction with the arrestment of publication of the book on which she had 'ventured her whole fortunes'.

The concern of the Marquis and his son appears to be twofold as can be deduced from letters written almost immediately to the Laird of Gaigie<sup>7</sup> and Drummond of Hawthornden: firstly on grounds that it was not the 'trew richt coppie' and secondly on account of the prevailing political situation of the Civil War. Drummond as a Royalist gives his opinion of the book as 'extreame puritanical'. 'He [Hume] justifieth the wrongs of the Earles of Douglas: that is hee condemnes the K[ing] and the Earles of Angusse for cutting them off and suppressing their rebellion', 'it containe manye, too muche of the humours of this present tyme'. He implies



the book 'will be much made of' and in particular the last part 'where discourses which authorise Rebellion and the forcing of consciences, and putting the sword in the peoples hand'. Since obviously the Marquis could not know the outcome of the Civil War he would want to keep his options open. Perhaps most telling was Drummond's reference to Hayward's 'Historye of Henrye the 4 of England' when it was dedicated to the last Earle of Essex 'procured great envye to the Earle and made the Author be keep in prisone some yeeres. And this same may fall forth, in the Dedication to your Lordship if the Prince had any notable persone to chalenge'.

Was there an element of envy or sour grapes on the part of Drummond since he too was writing a history?<sup>8</sup> However, it was certainly in keeping with the character of the Marquis that he should try to keep on the winning side. Although he had been informed by Charles in 1640 that there would be a breach between him and his 'Covenanting Rebelles', Douglas had taken no part in the hostilities of 1640, did not attend Charles when he came to Scotland in 1641 and kept a low profile until 1644. It was after the appearance of Anna Hume's publication that he signed the Covenant in June 1644, his son having done so four years previously. However, no sooner had he done so than, after Kilsyth when the star of the royalists seemed to be in the ascendant, he accepted a commission from Montrose and took part at the battle of



Philiphaugh. He was subsequently imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle and required to pay a heavy fine which must have hurt considerably as the previous year he had complained, 'I have gotten ane chairg from the Chanceler for XXIIIIIC pund of annuitie to be payit within sex days'<sup>9</sup> and had not the wherewithall to do it. The upshot was a public apology to Lanark Presbytery and the determination not to get his fingers burned again. When he was offered command of a regiment in 1651 he declined. In as much as the Marquis was an unreliable royalist, his son was an unreliable Covenanter who, after signing the Covenant in 1639, went to the Continent literally to watch the case for the crown at a safe distance for two years. He returned to sit as an elder in the General Assembly until 1649 after which he presented himself to Charles II in 1650 to be created Earl of Angus and Ormond. Perhaps it was because the royalist cause was definitely seen to be in decline that the injunction was removed,<sup>10</sup> and the book was published minus the Dedication to the Earl of Angus in case he should be associated with it.

Whereas banned books have a certain attraction, this was not the case with the history: the leaders of the family of Douglas were not in any way to be seen in a heroic mould, the Covenant was the issue of the day, and in a civil war situation The History of the House of Douglas and Angus was not likely to be seen as either

escapist or inspirational material. London's help to sell the book was invoked, but not surprisingly, despite the title changes, it still did not become a best seller.

It is, however, worth noting that at the time of the 1644 publication Drummond suggested to the Marquis to 'put forth a new Edition in which your Lordship may cause take away what is faultie and adjoin what is wanting. Your new Book would beare no authores name, save that it is collected or taken off the originall ancient recordes of your House'. Fraser maintains that the Hamilton manuscript appears to be the copy which the eleventh Earl intended to publish himself.<sup>11</sup> If that were so, one would expect change of emphasis, particularly in the sections in which Drummond mentions justifying the Douglas rebellion and criticising the King and Angus. One would also expect references to David Hume to be removed. But this is not so.

Close comparison of the Hamilton manuscript with the Anna Hume publication (which will henceforth be referred to as the manuscript and the book respectively)<sup>12</sup> shows marked differences, but not as suggested above and there is certainly no attempt to cast doubt on the authorship. In his Address to the Reader, signed D.H., in the manuscript Hume refers 'to painfull hours in searching out the records of former ages, the infallible proofes of ancient monuments, wrytts, publicke acts and such traditions onelie as were confirmed by faithfull

testimonie'. He goes on to give his definition of a history: 'the offer I doo make thee is veritie not words; examples of vertue not puffed up periods masking natural simplicitie the livelie force of a true historie'. In the book there is much more of an apology to the effect that an author can not please everyone: 'he who undertakes to write makes himself a mark of censure for men to level at' (line 2, 1st page of To The Reader). A scholarly touch which is lacking in all other manuscripts and editions of the history is the inclusion at the front of the manuscript of a 'Bibliographie' listing Boece, Major, Buchanan, John Leslie, Holinshed, the Black Book of Scone, the Register of Arbroath, an authentic manuscript written by Sir Richard Maitland, Sansovinus and Humbertus Locatus, Speed, Camden, Mr York and Mr Wentworth, Jean de Serres and Froissart, Carolo Sanst, Auriliano 'with sundry other evidence and charters belonging to the houses of Douglas and Angus and divers manuscript and particular records given to the Author of this Book', and it should be noted that letters and contracts are quoted verbatim throughout. Then there is the Preface: although the content is approximately the same in both - viz. the antiquity, nobility, greatness and valor of the Douglasses - the language and expression is quite different, e.g. the verse 'So many so good', which is called a 'vulgar Elogy' in the manuscript is described in the book as 'an old verse which is common in

men's mouths'. In the manuscript it is stated 'men well versed in this subject will not challenge me of any vayne or hyperbolical speech'. This becomes 'This is not any rhetorical amplification or poetical hyperbole but a positive and measured truth'. In the manuscript lack of exact knowledge about the origins of the family is blamed on the 'cruel dessigns' of Edward I, who destroyed ancient records, registers, evidence and monuments 'particularlie of the name of Douglas' and the generalisation 'but besydes the vulgar tradition conserved in the mouths and memories of men, there remained also some ancient histories and records, some original manuscripts and testimonies confirmed by foreign writers.' In the book there are precise references (1) the tradition of Sholto defeating Donald Bane (Preface p.2); (2) the Scoti of Plaisance (Preface p.2); (3) a monastic register from Icolmkill (Preface p.2); (4) reference to Douglasdale in the foundation charter of the abbey of Lesmahagow (Lesmie Hagoe) (Preface p.3); (5) the charter of the Royal Burgh of Ayr; (6) a mortmain granted to the bishop of Moray in the reign of King William (Preface p.3); (7) an indenture between Lord Douglas and Lord Abernethy; (8) three mentions in the public rolls at the time of Bruce (Preface p.3). All of these give the impression of being editorial work extracted from the subsequent text. In the book also there are the various marriages and connections with royal blood. This is not

in the manuscript, although a note in the eleventh Earl's handwriting about whether to include pedigree or not leads one to believe there could have been such a separate sheet, now lost. Under the head of Greatness, in addition to the reference to the magnificence of William the fifth Earl's train (Preface p.5), the contracts with Edward IV and Henry VI of England (Preface p.4) and the fact that great families became their dependants, the manuscript gives specific reference to military strength: an army of 30,000 making 'frequent incursions into England' returning 'loaden with preyes and booties'. William, first Earl of Douglas went to France with 3,000 men (Poitiers), Archibald, Earl of Wigtown took 4,000 to France (Bauge), his father transported to France 'uppon his own charges 20,000 men of whom manie were gentlemen of good accompte.' Under the head of Valour comparisons are made in the book with the Cummings and Percies, but no such details are given in the manuscript and the Fabii Cornелиi and Marcellii of classical times (Preface p.8).

And so to the history proper. In the manuscript the difficulty of finding out beginnings is again stressed and further reference is made to the destruction of records by Edward. In the book the opportunity to criticise Camden is not missed, 'not withstanding all his bragging' (p.1). However, the variations in the account of Donald Bane are interesting. In the manuscript he is

described as the Rebel Donald 'forgetting the alleadgence of a dutifull subiecte to his native prince', subjective statements which are not in the printed version. The manuscript then goes into detail about Donald's situation in Lorne. Finding himself enclosed by steep mountains and a deep river he sent messengers to entreat 'offering to resigne over to his soveraigne all his ambitions ... and to keepe ever after that an humble and due fidilite' to his king, only to be refused whereupon he made a rush for it and 'forced them to recule'. But at that very moment 'a certayne brave and worthie man with a fresh reserve ... did cast himself into the Throng and defeated the rebell Donald'. Sholto du Glasse no less. The MS then goes on to say that a document of great antiquity seen by the tenth earl in 1595 at Strathbogie confirms this. From then on Sholto was always employed in attendance on his sovereign and brought up his sons to be able 'for the service of there prince and countrie'. Over his successor there is some doubt as to whether there is a son and a grandson or just a son. At any rate there is virtually nothing to be said about either or both.

The facts about the brother William, father of the Scoti in Italy, are the same in both manuscript and book with the insertion in the manuscript of a passage on the origin of the Order of the Thistle as verified by Boece and the French Book of Estates and Empires. The contract



between Achaius and Charlemagne is referred to and how William Douglas in the course of 'his mightie expeditions against the rebellious and infidell Saxons' fell ill in Italy where the family of 'Spitim did imbrace him with much affection that he did take to wife the daughter of Antonio Stippim'. The book then gives precise confirmation through coats of arms, Italian writers and genealogy. The only material difference is in the genealogy where the eldest son of Albutus is John in the manuscript, Petrus in the book. The letter which the Earl of Angus received in 1622 is given in Italian and in translation.

In the account of William the first lord, the manuscript complains again about lack of evidence and the 'usurpation of Edward King of England (called Longshanks) at what tyme he did violentlie invad our country destroying to his power all manuments, registers and histories whereby he might abolish the memore of thos by past tymes and bring all things to confusion', a repetition of the angry statement in the preface but not printed in the book. William was made lord at the parliament of Forfar according to the register of Icolmkill. But this is not mentioned in the book although there is a reference to the register in the preface to the book, and as we are told in both book and manuscript, an extract from the register of Icolmkill came into the hands of John Reid, Buchanan's servitor



(p.11). The manuscript goes on to say, 'and then to Regent Morton then David Hume, diligent in collecting the present historie and in seeking out for that effect the faithful testimonies of those and lyke records'. Of the next second, third and fourth lords there is little of interest other than the book suggesting doubt about the succession. This is not conveyed in the manuscript where a page has been pasted over. Regarding William, his mention in the charter of Ayr granted by King David is supplemented by a few notes about King David's death and burial. There is also an interesting reference to the manuscript of Sir Richard Maitland, 'which manuscript was given to the earle of Mortoune Regent of the Kingdom' and refers to the marriage indenture between his son Hugh and the sister of Lord Abernethy. There is no mention in the manuscript of the second indenture securing Marjory's future in case of divorce or death of her husband. In the manuscript the sister of the earl of Carrick who marries the second son William is called Isobel, in the book Martha (p.14). This is the marriage that makes the Good Sir James and Robert Bruce cousins and in the words of the manuscript 'entres to the House of Douglas as aspyring to the Crowne'. Also in the manuscript is the reward of the Isle of Man given to William Douglas for royal service, whereas in the book it is to William the fourth of that name (p.20). Of the Hugh married to Abernethy little is stated; the emphasis

is on the Abernethy connection with the Cummings, his acquisition of the collegiate lands of Abernethy and Abbacy of Arbroath. A rhyme from the tradition of the common people in Douglasdale about Pattane Purdie is added in the manuscript. In the manuscript William the third is called 'Longlegge' whereas it is William the Hardie who is given this epithet in the book. In the manuscript he is whilst captured in Berwick 'induced to marry an English lady'. In addition to Douglas taking Disdeir [Durisdeer] and Sanquhar castles which is recounted in the book there is an account of the taking of Crawford Castle by Wallace, also how Wallace by the help of Edward Little 'resident there killed twenty of the English'. Also mentioned in the manuscript is the 'never conquered' theme, Douglas being styled Gardiano Nostro, and Edward's attempts to destroy the ancient monuments and laws of Scotland, this time described as 'the barbarous cruelties of a tyrannical mind, the detestable perfidie of the forenamed Edward Longshanks'. The book is more philosophical: 'a lesson for tyrants to teach and let them see how weak a thing tyranny is'. Again in the manuscript account of Edward's refusal to return his father's lands to the good Sir James 'sik malice had he druk up in his unpitifullheart' (p.21) is replaced in the book with the words 'so implacable was he'.

As can be seen from the examples quoted so far, the manuscript is a much more lively history. Edward's treatment of Bruce is rendered in French in the manuscript, 'Eh bien n'avons nous autre chose a faire que de conquerir des Royaumes pour vous'. The role of the monarch in relation to promises gets much wider treatment in the manuscript with classical and Biblical allusions 'once haveing given theire word be it to a Turke or infidell let them be carefull as true Christians to performe that one'. The manuscript also contains more of the Bruce history at this point; it, for example, enters details of the agreement and indenture with Cumming, but the book merely refers to the murder. Again the manuscript commends Douglas' robbing of Lambert: 'Let non blame this honourable action ... seeing the intention and end whereto the action tended was pious ... using in this extreme necessitie the moyens of private men for defence of the common libertie and countrie'. In the manuscript account of his exploits with Bruce there is mention of help from Lennox and Angus of the Isles and no reservations about the location in Loch Lomond (p.25) which is doubted in the book. Again, the book has a more restrained approach making philosophical references to their situation and lack of despair. The manuscript refers to the taking of Turnberry Castle although the book says the writers do not name it. The episode in Douglas Church has the

addition in the manuscript, 'so animated was the Lord Douglas for the slaughter of his loyal servant Thomas Dickson he caused all the prisoners to be hanged'. The verse that Sir John Walton's lady wrote to him about the keeping of Douglas Castle is included in the manuscript as well as an account of the death of Edward I and description of Edward forcing 'manie of the Ecclesiasticks and noble men (such I meane) as following the English faction till then ... to swere homage to him'. At Inverurie there is reference to the King's illness so that his brother Edward and the Lord Douglas take charge. Also in the manuscript reference is made to Donald of the Isles 'by persuasion of the English faction taking opportunitie to render himself soveraigne lord' and Argyle 'chosing to go to England and dye amongst strangers then as the true subiecte in the defense of his King and countrie' plus the Douglas presence at all expeditions and victories up to Bannockburn. There is also in the manuscript a description of Edward II's anger 'his ordinarie discourses contained nothing but threatnings against his enemies ... and his was to dessign people all the lowlands and eastern provinces with stranger nations by rooting out the naturall inhabitaintes'. The Carmelite friar with Edward is named as Robert Barton and in the manuscript account of the expeditions against England there is the reply to the papal legate about the source

of the quarrel: 'the barbarous cruelties, impieties frauds and tirannies committed by Edward of England and his predecessors against the Scottish, a nation more ancient than the English, professing Christianising before them and acknowledging nae superior in temporalitie under god'.

There is, however, in the manuscript no mention of the cursing of Douglas and Randulph by Canterbury and York and all the priests in England as mentioned in the book (p.38), but fulsome detail of Robert's instructions to Douglas and Murray to 'bereave the English armie of all commoditie' and Edward's ensuing anger: 'hee did burne and destroy all where he passed ... the old and sick who could not flee being massacred in beds or before the altars'. The Emerald Charter is detailed in both of them but the end of Edward II is described in the manuscript as 'falling into disgrace with his owne Queene, his sonne, and nobilitie is said to have in been put violentlie to death. However the manner was, his death was certain'.

With reference to the corruption of the Earl of Carlisle with Scots money at Billand (p.39), Major is quoted in the book as stating that the Scots were 'never so flush ... as to corrupt the English'. The manuscript refers to the partiality of English writers 'where names in civilitie I pass here under silence'. The Scots are said not to be as avaricious as others 'because of the

divers mines gold, silver and other metals not found in England'. The English are seen as 'labouring not only by all human policie and deceite. But with tooth and nayle with force and tirany also to subdue Scotland and that to this day'. The manuscript also contains a speech by Robert Bruce before he died, discouraging dissension, opposing the Lordship of the Isles, warning against fixed battle and warning to be on perpetual guard against England against whom there could be no perpetual peace. Regarding the journey to the Holy Land, unlike the book, the manuscript does not suggest that Douglas was not named by Bruce; also there is no criticism of Bruce's decision (p.50) to send Douglas out of the country. The manuscript then gives a series of reasons why the Good Sir James had not married: 'he remained free from all matrimoniall subiection, nor was he not altogether free from yielding by tymes to the fragilitie of some uncleane desires towards women - whereby wee find mention of twoe of his natural sonnes'. Not mentioned in the book is the conspiracy against Bruce after the King asked his nobility after what form they held their lands. The author complains about the lack of evidence of names only finding named Lord Abernethy and Sir William Soulis. The first book of the House of Douglas ends with a description of the universal regret for the Good Sir James at the news of his death.



Regarding Archibald governor of Scotland, considerable detail is given in the manuscript to the background to Duplin, Edward Balliol's army consisting of not just the 'Good Englishmen and navy given by Edward III' under Talbot but also the English who had been driven out of their possessions in Scotland, banished Scots and others who were 'desireous of novelties and alterations in hope of gaine and wanting nothing but a leader'. Again the manuscript compares Buchanan and Boece's version of the treason of the willow bush. The reference to Berwick and the hanging of Seton's sons, 'a fact not mentioned in the English histories', provides the opportunity to expatiate on the duties of a historian to tell the truth (p.57). In both book and manuscript William the Flower of Chivalrie is identified wrongly as Sir James's natural son (p.62), and the Pope who sends the message to Edward telling him to desist from invasion of Scotland is identified in the manuscript as Benedict rather than Boniface VIII. The account of the battle of Boroughmuir, near Edinburgh, in 1335 is enlivened in both book and manuscript by the detail of Sir David Annand (p.67) cleaving his enemy and his horse and leaving a mark in the pavement and of the woman in the Guelders (p.67) army who in single combat slew Robert Shaw and afterwards beat down her enemies on each side until she was eventually slain. In the book the various accounts of the siege of Kildrummy are compared thereafter with



the various acts of valour of the 'Flower of Chivalrie' against incredible odds like 500 to 40. Even having been run through the body with a spear he was only disabled for a season, but as soon as he was recovered with twenty men he slew and took sixty English, stole the English victuals, vanquished Lawrence Vaugh and fought five times in one day (p.71). Hence the name Flower of Chivalrie.

When King David granted the sherifffdom of Teviotdale to Ramsay, which resulted in Douglas killing his men and starving him to death, Hume attributes this behaviour to anger and blames the King's 'unadvisedness' (p.75) - a blatant example of special pleading for the Douglasses. Obtaining pardon through the good offices of the King's nephew the Flower of Chivalrie got his sherifffship plus the gift of Roxburgh Castle. His eventual death is seen as jealousy on the part of the Earl of Douglas and the author becomes very involved in the argument and reason for his murder with repeated use of the first person (p.78). Regarding William the first Earl, the manuscript gives the charter of confirmation of his lands and suggests because of discrepancies that there must be a charter of resignation. In the book his wives are all called Margaret whereas the manuscript says Agnes was his first wife. William like so many others was created Earl before the battle of Durham and the episode is recounted of the King striking his tasker Johne Copland

on the face with his gauntlet knocking out two of his teeth whereupon Edward III rewarded Copland and made him captain of the Castle of Roxburgh.

After recovering Douglasdale Douglas marched to England and the manuscript lists those killed on the Scottish side: Thomas Vasse, Andrew Scott of Balivery, John Gordon of Stitchell, William Harmiston, Thomas Preston and Alexander Mowbray, all valiant knights. Regarding the proposal of uniting Scotland and England, the book differentiates between the English and Scottish writers (p.84) but the manuscript states the King proposed to bring the King of England or his son into Scotland to possess the kingdom in case anything should happen to himself 'otherwise than good', a mild form of blackmail. The participation of the Earl with his brother at Poitiers resulted in the award of 'Knight of the Cockle'. The manuscript then goes on to list the various titles and awards made to Scots and goes on to talk of the marriage of Archibald near Bordeaux to a lady of 'Fayre estate and great note' who bore sons named Douglas. The influence of the Earl is stressed in the truce with John of Gaunt (p.89). His offer of asylum in Edinburgh to John of Gaunt is treated rather differently in the manuscript: the book states that after the expiry of the truce, in revenge for Lochmaben he, having spoiled Edinburgh and wasted the country, returned home; the manuscript states 'neither was he unthankful of the

courtesy received for in an expedition made thereafter as he went to Edinburgh he spoyled the Towne but safed it from fyre mindefull that he had received refuge therein ... a worthie fact and comendable for his humanitie and thankfulness'.

James second earl of Douglas was instrumental in renewing the ancient league with France (p.93). According to the manuscript it was put in eleven articles and thereafter confirmed by Charles VI and Robert III. This was followed by a year's truce with France only with invasion into Scotland when Scots would have no time to reply. The siege of Roxburgh is seen as 'taking opportunities of the winter season'. According to the manuscript the reason pretended was because they had better skill in siege warfare, the real reason was 'what was acquired by their industrie should accrue to them', viz. land. This according to the manuscript offended the Scots and Douglas to such an extent that he stated 'if friendlie duties were to be exacted to such a strict account then he might more justlie crave of him (the King of France) the charges of the whole warres which they had undergone for the King of France his cause: when as otherwise they might have been at peace with England'. And thus was the siege left. Where in the book French behaviour is criticised (p.95), a comparison is made in the manuscript between Scots and French behaviour; war in France is 'all insolence as if roberies were publicly

permitted than by the fashion of Scotland where the subjects have noe less iustlie and modestlie than in the tyme of peace'. The King's son John is described as 'dull' in the book as opposed to 'soft' in the manuscript. In the manuscript Percy is described 'who for his activitie forwardnesse and hastinesse never resting when there was any service to be done upon that border had the name of Hotspurre given him'. In addition to the detailed account of Otterburn which the manuscript states occurred in August, not as printed in July, we are given a detailed address to his troops by Douglas and then the names of the English taken prisoner - 'Titles to wearie a Spaniard'. Concerning William lord of Nithsdale, the Black Douglas, additional daughters are given in the manuscript: Margaret and Beatrix. Also in the manuscript is the verse about his expedition to Ireland and the verse of the threat of the Black Douglas. His importance in reconquering from the Infidel and in Danzig are stressed in the book (p.111).

After the death of James at Otterburn his brother Archibald, third earl, succeeded him. His refusal of a title is referred to in the manuscript. 'He would be a Dreak said he if the Earl of Huntly was a Duke'. In the episode of the Earl's support of Redpath, who was dispossessed by March, a letter is quoted stating: 'I will not suffer him till be wronged he was leame of a legge by a strok of ane horse'. Reference to the

rivalry between March and Douglas over the marriage to Prince David and March's subsequent alliance with Hotspur is followed in the manuscript by a lengthy account of the prince's behaviour: 'so long as his Father in law the earl and queen lived the prince behaved himself. But after both their deaths and having well gotten the rynes of libertie in his hands, he fell to all kinds of loose behaviour seeking to defile widows various virgines and nunes with all kynd of women in all places where cam'. He then goes on to say that Albany 'famished the prince till death' and how the King<sup>11</sup> 'afrayd for his other sone' (i.e. David, duke of Rothesay, d. 1402), resolved to send James (later James I) to France and being affrayd hee be aprehendit by the Inglish shipes in the way' wrote a courteous letter to the King of England and made the prince 'to remaine on the Basse till all was provayditt for his voyage'. 'Notwithstanding the prince was taken by the Inglish ... and married to the Duke of Somerset's daughter', all of which is more pertinent to the next Archibald, the fourth earl. It is noteworthy that neither in the book or the manuscript is there any suggestion of Douglas involvement in the prince's death.

Archibald the fourth earl is described by Hume as 'Tineman' (p.115) and he justifies his award of the epithet to this Archibald, but mentions confusion and other claims. Modern historians do not agree with his choice. It is stated in the manuscript that the Duke of

Northumberland fled into Scotland to Walter Wardlaw, archbishop of St Andrews, taking with him his grandchild the young Percy, but not thinking him safe enough sent him into France with the young prince James since they were the same age. It is notable that the author is very sympathetic to the Douglasses over the treatment of the young prince saying that Douglas would have reclaimed him from his excesses and saved his brother in law had he been there! But in fact he had been captured at Homildon (p.118) - Douglas was released on condition that he helped Percy against Glendower (p.119), but was again taken prisoner at Shrewsbury. However, so highly thought of was he by the king that 'his Majestie caused ane excellent painter to draw his portraiture'. The terms of his delivery are clearly expressed in 'one Indenture yet extant' (p.123). In the manuscript the death of Henry V is associated with sacking the church and lands of St Fiacre, allegedly by a Scot. The account of the Earl of Wigtown's sickness varies slightly with the addition that he went to Ae onia (Iona?) where he made supplication to St Colme. According to the manuscript there were 12,000 Scots (p.128) on the Dauphin's side and this is the opportunity for the author to give details of the creation of the Scots Guard by Charles VII and the history of Scots' involvement as guards of the King of France starting with St Louis. Other recognition of the Scots in France is included, such as the right of



naturalisation. He explains the reason for this digression is because he has detailed what Scotland suffered through the French and is redressing the balance.

In the account of Archibald the fifth earl, Hume reflects on why James imprisoned so many important people (p.136), including Douglas and Kennedy, but there is no suggestion of their implication in his brother's death. The point is made that Douglas's exit to France allows others to grow great, particularly Angus who is the cause of his ruin (p.138). However, the manuscript goes on to explain at length that the reason for the ill treatment of Douglas is that he had bound himself to England and witnesses are quoted. Reference is also made to a visit by Lord Scrope and ambassadors asking for the ending of the league with France in return for Berwick, with Douglas alone opposing the suggestion. However, the absence of Douglas is seen as the opportunity for the rise of Livingston and Crichton who are portrayed as complete villains with no redeeming features. Douglas is also seen in the manuscript as pursuing Athol for the King's murder.

This Earle was the man by whose meanes hee was brought back agayne to a second tryall put uppon the pannell in Edinburgh and convicted as the chief mover and contriver of the treason; and he and the rest of his associates theruppon condignely punished as was fitting. To which severe execution Aeneas Silvius (afterwards Pope Pius II) as then legate for Pope Eugenius IV in Scotland was an eye witnesse and as a worthy prelate commended highly the impartiall justice



of Scotland. For he had said before that the Scottish were not worthie to enjoy any kingdomes or honours if they did not condignely punish the murtherers of theire King.

An additional point in the manuscript is that the heirs of Storravan got lands from Athol as reward for his part in killing the king. The author refers to the fact that Crichton, a parvenu, was the first chancellor 'in our chronicles' and Douglas took such indignation that he kept his own jurisdiction which caused the men of Annandale 'to slight and contemn the authority of the governor', thus creating a state within a state. Crichton and Livingston then proceeded to fall out whereupon Crichton approached Douglas only to be repulsed, unwisely as it turns out, with the speech quoted ending 'if both should perish the country were the better' (p.142). Although always partial to the Douglasses, the author does criticise Archibald Douglas for allowing the men of Annandale to overrun 'the adjacent countries'. The point is made however that Crichton and Livingston combined for fear of Douglas, but when he died they resorted to their rivalry. The subsequent history recounted in the book and the manuscript has no variation. It is identical in its account of the Black Dinner, with Crichton and Livingston as the villains of the piece. However, he does refer to them as maintaining all they did was for the good of the country. Hume sees it as avarice. He points out that although there was mayhem going on in the country at the

time with the men of the Isles putting to fire and sword, the killing of Colquhoun of Luss, the Boyd-Stewart feud, only Douglas and his dependers were criticised and their crimes exaggerated. Again the duplicity of Crichton and Livingston is underlined in the manuscript: 'better to have been about a Nero or Domitian than any Christian prince'. The manuscript does not mention Douglas's age whereas the book states he was but 14 years of age at his father's death (p.148). To be fair, Hume does show us Douglas power and why he was seen as such a threat 'refusing to obey the new men, he behaved as one that thought he would not be in danger of them; he entertained a great family; he rode ever well accompanied when he came in public; 1,000 or 2,000 horses were his ordinary train; he had great friendship and dependance of old; he had been careful to keep them and had also increased them and conciliated many new followers and clients by his beneficence and liberality and his magnificence'. He also 'dubbed knights' as he thought men worthy, 'which he did by vertue of his dignities of Duke and Earle'. One can understand why this youngster should be a 'sore thorn in their foot and mote in their eye' (p.147). The author goes on to make the point that new men commonly try to persuade their princes that the old order are their enemies and that all great men are their enemies. The manuscript goes on to say 'whereas indeed they are the truest servants and most able to do them good service

and may be most easily made most willing to serve them'. This point was obviously being made for the benefit of the Royal reader.

It is stated in both book and manuscript that the murdered Douglas was succeeded by his uncle, but it was in fact his great-uncle, James the Gross, of whom Hume maintains there is no mention either in his brother's or nephew's time, or if he did anything to revenge their murder. Hume suggests 'belike as he hath been corpulent so hath his corpulency caused a dullness of spirit as commonly it doth' (p.161). The manuscript at this point gives the additional information about the duke of Albany who 'running at the tilte with the Duke of Orleans was with an spelcke of his lance hurt whereby he died'. William, the son of Gross James, was more akin to his forebears in that he endeavoured by all means to augment the grandeur of the house by both friendship and dependances. He made it 'surpass all others that were but subjects' (p.161). He was blamed for all lawlessness even the Athol/Gorme affair because of his 'countenance to broken men' i.e. Borderers 'more than was fitting and did peece and peece impaire the ancient good opinion generally held of that house'. Crichton's harrying of Corstorphine, Abercorn and Blackness has the suggestion of collusion with Angus, Morton and Kennedy, but Hume discounts this as beyond their range. Great play is made of the fact that they were an insult to the

king and law and if Douglas had done it it would have been seen as rebellion. In the slaying of the earl of Crawford over the bailiery of Arbroath, the manuscript adds that Crawford having 'entered in between the two parties (Ogilvy and the master of Crawford) without armour was stricken in the face with a spear'. After this, intent on vengeance, Douglas besieged Edinburgh Castle, but Crichton came to terms.

There is then an account of the marriage alliances made by Douglas to promote his family. The analogy of Pyrrhus and Cyneas is detailed at length (p.173) and Hume states he has sifted through histories and can find no evidence for the charge of avarice and tyranny laid against Douglas, although as a historian he admits: 'I know not if I should so revere any man's opinion as to believe it absolutely and with implicit faith because he hath said it'. Regarding the marriage alliances of his third and fourth brothers involving titles of earl of Moray and earl of Ormond and fifth brother lord of Balvenie, Hume praises his kindness 'preferring of his family by all lawful means'. Annandale men are described as 'but thieves who had nothing but spoyle before their eyes, more set upon spoile than victorie', and the English army as coming forth 'with such confidence and securitie that they seemed not to come to warre but to a pompe and triumph such was the trust of themselves and contempt of the enemye'. When the king

urged Douglas to use his power in the suppression of robbers the speech in reply is given in full in the manuscript. The episode of the murder of Colvill, in revenge for the death of Auchinleck, a Douglas dependant, is recounted in more lively language in the manuscript, where the deed is reported as an 'enormous' rather than 'insolent fact'. The visit to Rome according to the manuscript was to 'give the King a tyme to settle his choller as it was interpreted by his enemies and in the judgement of men to this day'. Hume finds fault with Buchanan's statement about George being destined to be earl after his brother (p.181), being the youngest. After the episode of Symington and the sixty days given to compear, the king moved into Galloway. Douglas sent his brother to intercede and was received back and rewarded with the lieutenancy of all Scotland (p.183). But after his visit to England he was spoiled of his lieutenancy. The bond (p.186) with 'Crawford, Ros, Ormond, the Lord of Balvennie and the Lord Hamilton chieffe of that name, many Barrones and gentell men with their allayes wassells and servants to a greater number' is given in greater detail in the manuscript as is the account of his final and fatal visit to Stirling (p.190). In addition to the description of Hamilton being repulsed, we are told no one was allowed to go in with him except his page Lockhart who ended up jumping over the wall. In reviewing the career of this earl, Hume

maintains that he had never been unjust only 'vehement'. Hume's main criticism is the suggestion that he got the assistance of thieves but as he states the extent of this is not known.

Not only were William's brothers shocked and astonished at the news of their brother's death but according to the manuscript 'the people in general detesting the fact in such sorte that the King was driven to such a strait and exigent as shalbe seene hereafter'. James the brother who had been acknowledged heir took on his brother's mantle. The manuscript gives additional information about James 'from the manuscript of a Mr Ringan Dalyell who was formerly ane priest before the alteration of Religione and aifter schoolmaster at Dumfries in which he declared many remarkable passages of the House of Douglas such as this James being second brother to earle William was designed to be a Churchman for the bishopric of Dunkell. And for that end he was brought up at Paris in the College of Sorbonne and was called Mr James Douglas', but never took orders. He was called home to Scotland before he went to the Jubilee and made to resign his title of bishopric to his brother. This ties in with the criticism Hume makes of Buchanan's account of George being destined to be earl. Both in the book and the manuscript the finger is pointed at Bishop Kennedy as the 'eminence grise' of the king who showed him that 'within a short tyme his Majesty would

gain greatte contentment'. After the battle of Brechin between Moray and Huntly and the siege of Dalkeith, reference is made in the manuscript but not in the book to the agreement, the Appointment, between the king and the Earl whereby the Earl and Lord Hamilton would make no bond or league against the king, dated 28 August 1451, followed by another agreement promising loyalty to the king, dated 16 January 1452. These are written out in full in the manuscript but not mentioned in the book.

Regarding the Earl's marriage to his brother's widow the fair Maid of Galloway (called Beatrix in both), Hume is obviously shocked but states he has read in one source that her first marriage was not consummated and that was the basis for the application for a Papal dispensation (p.199). However, as the manuscript points out, the Earl of Angus and Lord Dalkeith 'did shew much grudge at the foresaid marriage' in respect the said lady was not bestowed on one of them she being heretrix of 'many braw lands' and so they with the Bishop Kennedy 'did study the earl of Douglas his overthrow'. Again the manuscript points out the reason the marriage agreement did not take effect was because of them.

When Douglas sent Hamilton to England for supplies, according to the manuscript, the king made public proclamation 'that all men should be ready with pavilions and fourtie dayes wittuales to attend his Majesty in going against the rebels in the north and especially the



Earl of Crawford' which made Crawford seek clemency after reflecting on the various services his family had done their monarch and which the manuscript details at length (including the first earl who on St George's Day overthrew the Lord Wallis at a joust on London Bridge to his own and his country's 'eternal fame and memorie'). The reason there was no help at this juncture from England according to the manuscript was that Hamilton found the king of England so troubled with his own affairs at home that he could not give him the help he wanted, rather than the declaration of Douglas about not leaving such a blot on his country. Nonetheless the earl and his brother went to England and as he moved south those that did not faithfully promise to 'syd with him at his returne he spoyled their lands'. After his defeat at Annandale (p.203) forfeiture was inevitable. However, the manuscript differs from the book in saying that the fair Maid of Galloway 'we find not hir to be forfatt nor yet contained in the forfature the reason being the Black Knight Sir James Stewart of Lorne did intercede mightily for her so that the King received her courteously and married her to the said John Stewart'. The letter of forfeiture is copied out in the manuscript with apologies for the state of the original document 'being worne out'. After stirring up Donald of the Isles to renew his claim to the Isles (p.203), Douglas went back to England to take part with Percy in a raid on

the Merse. After which nothing is heard of him for twenty years (p.205) when he is noted to be the first Scot to get the Order of the Garter. A final show of arms was in conjunction with Albany at Burnswark in 1483 when he surrendered and was allowed by James III to retire to Lindores. However, Hume states that it was reported he was approached by both sides in the 1488 rebellion, refusing both with reference to either the 'Black Coffin' or 'Black Coin' (p.206), the manuscript suggesting the Black Coffin wherein his slain brother's body was kept 'that coffine did much more stick in his stomak'. Although this is the end of the House of Douglas, the manuscript goes on to say it continues in 'a native branch of that stocke ingrafted thereunto'.

There is no doubt the manuscript and the book are closely related, in many places identical word for word. However, what the manuscript contains is additional material of a factual nature, copies of documents, details of battles, related genealogy, and what is happening at the time in England or France. What is in the book, but not in the manuscript, is verse at the end of each section, more rhetoric and philosophy - on the nature of courage, jealousy, fear and ambition, etc. Certainly the manuscript makes more interesting reading. Anna Hume's publication is unquestionably sympathetic to the Douglasses, but so is the manuscript. If this was what the marquis intended publishing he was not changing

emphasis or heeding Drummond's comments. This would indicate that it was not, as Drummond suggested, the support and justification of the Douglasses at the expense of the king and Angus that was dangerous or controversial. Rather it was the history of the House of Angus itself.

## NOTES

## CHAPTER TWO

1. Sir William Fraser, The Douglas Book (Edinburgh, 1885), priv. printed, 252.
2. SRO TD 87/86. This manuscript together with the copy of the House of Angus has only recently been discovered among the Hamilton papers on temporary loan in the SRO. It is useless to attempt individual page references from this manuscript as the pagination is variable, some pages being numbered and renumbered several times.
3. It should be remembered that the fourth son of the marquis who obtained the interdict against publication was to become duke of Hamilton by marriage to Anne, Duchess of Hamilton.
4. Adv. MS 34.6.21. This manuscript is entered in the Summary Catalogue as 1644 but it is in fact undated. Enquiry as to the catalogue date revealed that it is customary to lodge undated manuscripts under the date of publication.
5. George P Johnston, The First Edition of Hume of Godscroft's History (Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, vol. IV). George Johnston describes himself Library Expert and Dealer in Curious Old and Rare Books.
6. This separate sheet is entitled 'Remarkable Notes'.
7. Fraser, The Douglas Book, 252, 254.
8. Sir William Drummond of Hawthornden, The History of Scotland from the year 1423 until the year 1542 (London, 1655).
9. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iv, 252, 254.
10. P.C.R. 30 July 1646.
11. Fraser, The Douglas Book, Introduction, p. lviii.
12. The page references apply only to the book since the pagination of the manuscript is totally misleading, insertions, paste-overs and double numbering adding to the confusion.

## CHAPTER THREE

THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF ANGUS; THE MANUSCRIPT  
AND THE 1644 EDITION

A comparison of the second volume of David Hume's published history<sup>1</sup> with that of the Hamilton manuscript<sup>2</sup> shows even greater discrepancies.

The early history of the House of Angus 'before it came to the name of Douglas' is dealt with in considerable detail in the manuscript, albeit with the admission 'being hydde in the darke cloudes of antiquities neyther is the progress much clearer, the footsteppes ... being heir and theare, interrupted, defaced for the most parte and discontinued altogether'. In the book one is provided only with a cursory outline or summary of this period.

Codhardus, for example, slew Culenus 'as he was coming to Skone' is added in the manuscript 'in 839 or as others say 824'. Moreover there is the moralising so typical of Hume, 'But what is it will bynde anger if wee once give way to it. All passion is best overcome by resisting it...'. Concerning the murder of Cruthnethus by his grandson, son of Finella, not only is one given a detailed account but also the involvement of Finella. When the grandfather rebuked the youth, 'his mother being informed thereof blowes upp the fyre and puts her sone in furry joyning thereunto treason against her father' for the son returned 'as a grandchild to his grandfather's home and is received as such but calleth in more companie

whome he had privily at hand' and killed the old man with all his family and added 'covetousness to his paracide and cruell treachery by spoyling of his house, goods and lands'. But 'the gentlemen of Angus entering his country in Mernes' sacked and despoiled it since there was open war between the two provinces until pacified by King Kenneth. Cruthlint and the principal offenders were punished in exemplary fashion with the exception of Finella 'reserved for another wickedness and paracide to punish the murther committed by the king on Malcolm the son of his brother by poysoning him privately'. When the King 'came in familiarly but unadvisedly to such a devilish woman or rather vyper or tigre he was courteously received but in the end cruelly and craftily yea currouslly slayne' in her castle of Fettercairn. And here the source is quoted: 'The manner is reported to be thus as is sett downe by our learnedest historian Buchanan' and reference is made to the ingenious 'molten statue of brass' which shot out arrows.

Similarly with Macbeth the story is given in detail: how he righted the wrong done to Banquo; vanquished MacDowell; defeated Sweyn; created law and order in Caithness, Ross, Sutherland, the Mearns and the Isles; put down the Galloway rebellion under MacKeill; built Dunsinane; and caused Macduff to flee to England and ally with Malcolm Canmore. The statement 'I will not amuse you here with the prophesies' would suggest familiarity



with the Shakespeare play. All this is omitted in the book, the reference to Macbeth being 'of whom the history is sufficiently known'. Apart from the reference to Buchanan and the 'eldest wryters', the attitude to this period is best summed up in the statement: 'whoe shall informe me better shall have his deserved thanks, whoe cannot bring beter let him rest contented with what is found'.

In the manuscript Boece is quoted in reference to the creation of the first earl. Copying the example of other nations having the nobles called after their lands, 'his Majesty elevated some few worthy and well deserving noble men to be Earles, some to be Lords and some to be Knights. At which time a certaine worthy noble man of the qualities of Thane was for his worth and valour ranked in the number of the first and most honourable degree of that creation and intitulated Earle of Angus'. In the book Boece is merely alluded to. Again in the manuscript there is pointed reference to lack of information on this earl's other names or designation either on account of 'the slouth and negligence of our wryters in those days' or, and this takes up a theme repeatedly referred to in the first book:

the policie and malice of the after usurpers of our Kingdom (I mean the Edwards Kings of England) who taking their opportunitie uppon the broyles and differences betwixt the factions of the Bruce and Balliol which divided the land in twoe each man sydeing with th' one of them or th' other. The aforesaid Kings of England (I say) did invade with

their nomberous Armyes this whole land spoyling and distroying all the ancient Monuments and records that they could possiblīe come by.

No name is given to the father of Gilchrist in the book (p.206), but in the manuscript he is referred to as Gilbride 'as our records and evidences of the house of Angus doe testify especially that of the register of Arbroth ... and as a chartre of perambulation between him and the said Abbey beares with his sonne Gillchrist confirmed afterwards'. Again the manuscript goes into great detail over the role of Gilchrist in the battle in which King William was captured - King William who is described as the first Scottish king to be styled defender of the Church - and the aspirations of Gilbert of Galloway to usurp the crown. The latter is described as 'a most cruell man who because his brother disapoynted his desyres he caused both his eyes to be plucked out and his hands to be cut off'. There is also an account of the papal legate's attempt to persuade the assembled Scottish bishops to receive the Archbishop of York as their Metropolitan as recounted in Boece, Holinshed and the Scotichronicon. Gilbert's murder of his wife and subsequent flight in the book is merely described as 'having found her false he put her to death, and fearing the King fled into England but afterwards was pardoned' (p.207) compared with 'upon suspicion of his wife's adulterie he strangled her in his house of Maynes not a myle from Dundie whereupon King William caused cast

downe his house and banished himselfe and his two sonnes Gilbride and Duncan out of the realme '. Having fled to England where they found nothing but 'derision and daunger' they returned to Scotland incognito. 'They earned a poore living by digging to the ground in a base disguise like country clownes' until the King passed one day, going from Arbroath to Perth, when they knelt before him and asked for pardon. As a result the king bade them follow him to Forfar where he restored the Earl and both his sons to their lands, honours and dignities 'that onely excepted which was formerly given to the Abbay of Arbroth'.

There is constant reference to documentary evidence in the manuscript: 'we fynd likewise that after the Earle's restitution he confirmed (as his father had formerly done) a Chartre of perambulation to the sayd Abbay of Arbroth', Gilchrist himself doting to the Abbey 'Parthencrag with the fishing thereof, for the soules of his predecessors, his own, his wife's and his highnes'. Again issue is taken with 'our writers' who claim that the two sons died without children whereas the younger's son Malcolm succeeded him 'verified by the evidence of the house of Angus'. Gilbride, the elder son, succeeded his father Gilchrist 'witnes a Chartre or evident instantlie in the Chartre Chest of the house of Angus with King William's seal at it, given by him'. That Duncan was Gilchrist's son 'sundrie evidents which are

yet extant doe testifie for wee fynd that Duncan Earl of Angus doth confirme the twoe last chartres of four churches given by Gilchrist Earl of Angus to the Abbey of Arbroth with Mainsooth, Kirriemoore, Maynes, Strathyre and confirmeth the last with theise words 'Gilchristus pater meus witnes Dno rege Guilelmo'. Reference is made to another 'evident' to prove Malcolm the son of Duncan: 'Malcolmus comes Angusia donationem illam de Manisooth Kirrimure Maynes et Strathire quam Gilbertus avus meus comes de Angus eis fecit et Duncanus pater meus eis confirmavit.. pro anima Dni Regi Guilelmi pro anima patris et matris meae et pro animabus meorum antecessorum et successorum... Apud Forfoord'. All this is omitted from the book, as is the fact that his successor John Cuming married his only daughter Mathilde and left her a widow 'as divers confirmations given by hir to the Abbay of Arbroth doe testifie in these terms - Mathildis comitissa de Angus in legitima potestate viduitatis confirma donationem quam Gilchrist comes de Angus pro avus meus fecit eis de terra de Partencraig cum piscaris'.

According to the manuscript, this widow married Gilbert of Umphramille and had an only daughter Margaret who married John Stewart, one of the six governors of the Interregnum of Alexander III. Camden, one is told, refers to this Gilbert in his Britannia but 'as in other thinges soe alsoe in this, the English writers doe

amisse' and Edward I is referred to in the manuscript as 'usurper of the Crowne of Scotland'. Margaret's identity is verified by a Charter given by Duncan, earl of Fife to Margaret 'which is extant in the Marquis of Douglas' Chartre chist'. On the other hand there is a general vagueness in the book, e.g. 'his father John, or himself, married the heiress of Boncle', (p.207) and 'Thomas, who died in Dumbarton castle, imprisoned there, but for what is not known', (p.207) whereas the manuscript states this was part of King David's deliberate policy to punish those he believed had deserted him at the Battle of Durham.

In fact in the book this whole section 'the house of Angus in generall before it came to the Douglasses' (p.207) is treated as of no great interest or importance, giving the reader the impression it has been summarily dealt with in order to save time, space and effort on the part of the writer, for the later history.

When William, earl of Douglas married the inheretrix of Angus, this was seen as 'the root from which all the rest are sprung' (p.208). His son George, who was taken prisoner at the Battle of Homildon Hill in 1402, had a daughter whose second husband was earl of Ruthven from whom 'that house is descendit'. Unlike the book the manuscript refers to George's son William the third earl in connection with the murder of James I at Perth and reference is made to the contract of marriage between his

son James and the King's sister Jean, 'yett extant amongst the evidents of the house of Douglas'. With this James is found the division in the name of Douglas - according to the manuscript at the instigation of Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, who supported Livingston and Crichton against the earls of Douglas. It is suggested by the manuscript that:

the most sure foundation and apperrand growth for both their houses was the decaying of the house of Douglas which during the standing thairof they neided not lounk for especially the house of Angus. But the other being cut then would the earle of Angus acquere not only the most part of the earl of Douglas's lands but also be exalted to the first place of dignatie amongst the Scottish nobilitie which utherways he could hardly obtaine or aspeir unto, he being a cadet of such a pusant and matchles house...'. .

The point is made that even if they were not siding openly against Douglas their attitude must have been known since Robert Lord Fleming, brother-in-law to the earl of Douglas and his special friend 'after the spoyling of Abercorn by Crichton, spoyled the Angus lands in North Berwick'. The final upshot was that Fleming gave his bond to the Earl 'as it is yett extant in the Charter Chest of the house of Douglas'. The bond is then written in full and dated 24 September 1445.

With George, surnamed the great, there is one main difference between the book and the manuscript: in the former he is uncle (p.210), in the latter brother, the argument in the former based on age, in the latter depending on a discharge extant in the Charter Chest



which exonerates Earl George of 'all Byrane dewties adebted by his brother or his father to the exchequer'. The role of Bishop Kennedy is again emphasised in encouraging Angus to go against the Douglasses 'who drew all to themselves' and were 'too great already in the King's eyes'. The point is made that although George gained greatly from the house of Douglas nonetheless he reduced his own patrimony and revenues of Angus by converting most of the lands of Angus from property to superiority in order to gain service and dependence. 'He bestowed liberallie of his lands in that Northern province lyeing some what farr from him and his commandments and poure in the South' and made exchange of land in Angus for Border land: Maines and Clavers for Eskdale and a hundredth merk land for the lordship of Crawfordmuir.<sup>3</sup> 'From this time furth his friendship and poure was greatt'. Most significantly it is stated he was the first 'that recognised the bonds of manrent<sup>4</sup> of divers greatt persons, by the which his friendship and poure was greatt... he might have raised upon his own border lands 2,000 good horsemen besyde futmen'. Further evidence is the Lord Hamilton's bond of manrent quoted in both book and manuscript, occasioned, it is deduced, by the intercession of Angus with the King for the release of Hamilton from Roslin after the Abercorn episode. Regarding the role of George in the fall of the Douglasses, it is suggested that he hung back until

the king made open war against James Douglas. This attitude is not excused. Douglas is criticised over the marriage of the Maid of Galloway and the Douglasses 'drawing all to themselves' but it is made clear that Angus was hopeful of the king's liberality particularly with regard to land. The importance of George is stressed in both book and manuscript in the indenture (p.215) with Henry VI of England and his role in the siege of Alnwick. The death of James II at Roxburgh is mentioned in the manuscript along with the fact that Angus too was injured. The crowning of the young king by Angus is also referred to only in the manuscript.

Archibald, sixth earl of Angus, called 'Bell the Cat' (p.219) in the book, is referred to as 'the Great' in the manuscript. Much more detail is provided in the manuscript about his in-laws the Boyds, the change at court and their subsequent downfall; how Thomas Boyd, who had married the king's sister, was sent to bring home the king's bride; during his absence his father was disgraced, his brother executed and he and his wife fled to Burgundy. Called home by her brother, his wife was imprisoned and when Boyd did not compear, his marriage was declared null and void. She was then made to marry James Hamilton of Cadzow. The king's proclivity for magic is also detailed in the manuscript, giving as the reason for James's treatment of his brothers a forecast by a soothsayer that 'his Majesty should die by an

insurrection of his nobilitie whereof his nearest kinsman should be the chief'. The mere word 'murder' (p.224) in the book is replaced in the manuscript by 'caused execute him to death by letting his blood in luckwarm water', much more graphic and colourful writing, as is the description of the page Ramsay who 'lept in the bed beyond the King and at his Majesties intercession was spared'. Again when Angus was approached by the king to avenge his enemies, 'to refuse might endanger his life' (p.228) is the book's description of his attitude, whereas the manuscript states, 'he had before the eyes of his mynd his coussin William, earl of Douglas's death by the same King's father'.

There is no doubt that Angus was playing a double game advising the king and then reporting to the dissident nobles. Also reported in the manuscript is the approach made by the nobility to James, earl of Douglas in retirement at Lindores to lead them, his refusal and subsequent approach by the king, refused on account of the 'black coffer in Stirling'. The manuscript also provides much more detail of the king's plans to counter the nobles as well as their fear that the arrival of the Pope's legate Andreas de Caswell would weaken their cause with the common people. For the ensuing peace Angus, the Humes and the Hepburns were to be praised and, according to the manuscript 'great fruitfullness of the

ground followed also that year (1488) with the peaceable inclination of the subjects in so much that an Golden Age was rissen'.

Like his predecessors, land acquisition was important to Archibald. In addition to the indentures with Hugh Douglas, the son of the late earl of Ormond mentioned in the book (p.232), an insight into his machinations is provided, in that Angus 'did use all his gudlie meines with the King about the solemne days of Pash in anno 1496 to get his coussigne Hugh dean of Buchane elected'. The reason for his confinement in Arran is given as his association with Jean Kennedy, the king's paramour. Although there is reference to his reinstatement and familiarity with the king, - 'Goe thy way to my Gossope the King', - nonetheless Angus was confined again in Dumbarton till he resigned the lordship of Liddesdale in favour of Bothwell. Angus was given charge of the king's ships, but it was Hume who was appointed warden of all three marches even though the East and Middle Marches had been under the government of the earls of Angus for several generations. Perhaps this is related to the alleged contact of the Earl with Henry VII of England. Angus's attempt to dissuade James IV from making battle at Flodden is covered in both book (p.233) and manuscript. The latter goes into much more detail about the battle and the exchange between George, master of Angus, and the king, although how that came to be

reported is difficult to imagine. The story that the king escaped only to be killed by the servants of Lord Hume is related in the manuscript. Sons George and William as well as two bastard sons having been killed at Flodden, Angus survived only a year after. The son George, master of Angus, had governed the Borders and it is stated in the manuscript 'he morgadged much of his estaitt which his father did bestow upon him, partly by the mariadge of his daughter and partly by his own liberalities'.

There is no doubt that the most colourful of the Angus family was Archibald, seventh earl of Angus. The book commences his chapter (p.238) by listing his marriages, children both legitimate and illegitimate and their descendants, the manuscript merely the legitimate descendants. There follows a lengthy eulogy in the book typical of Hume in full flight, on the qualities of Archibald that made him such an attractive match for the Queen Dowager. 'First of his place and descent (p.239) ... first of the north of Scotland for favour and comeliness of personage... in knowledge, skill and understanding'. A similarly sycophantic account is given of Margaret: 'a lady so virtuous' etc. The reason for such an outpouring was of course the descent from this marriage of King James VI & I 'now happily reigning' for whom this work was intended: 'that race of kings so noble

beyond all... so noble so worthy so heroical...'. The manuscript, however, provides practical reasons for the marriage:

The Queen Dowager finding the authoritie of hir place was turned weak and had the injoying but the name of governing, the people rather delighting to live without rule and disorder than to be subject to the obedience of a woman tho' a queen, as also to save hir sone King James from the hands of an insulting nobilitie and further hir estaitt, she resolved to match with some noble man of Scotland eminent in power and worth who could and would protect hir and hers in greatt extrematis'.

The reason for Henry VIII's consent is made clear in both: to restrain Scotland from incursions, and provide a counterpoise to the French. Both emphasise the jealousy of Hume, 'so jealous of the poure and greatnes of the earl of Angus that he plotted be all meanes he could and bent his wholl thoughts on nothing so much as how he might impaire his present greatnes and prevent his future growth' (p.241). After all, Angus had two powerful kings as brothers-in-law. The antagonism of the Archbishop of Glasgow is explained in the manuscript: Angus, soon after the marriage, took the Great Seal from him and gave it to William Elphinstone. The division of the nobility into a Hume/French faction against the Angus/English faction resulted in the triumph of Hume and the governorship of Albany. The disputed Archbishopric of St Andrews is quoted as the cause of the animosity of Hepburn to Hume (Hume having supported Forman). In the manuscript there is the account of how Hepburn insinuated himself with the



Governor Albany: 'His meanes were by brybeing some of the courtiers, accusing of others and by shewe of knowledge in the Scottish affayres to a man wholly ignorant thereof'. Employed by Albany 'to cognoze of such as oppressed the Comons' and having examined the extent of feuds and factions and reporting on them, he maintained the only solution was to bring power from France 'to break their contumacie' and in the meantime get rid of the 'principall causes of those underfactions' i.e. Angus, Hume and Archbishop Forman.

It is explained in the manuscript that, of the three, Hume was the main target, being more powerful, older, more experienced in matters of state and more ambitious by nature. In addition 'odious rumours were constantlie avouched': he had taken arms against James III, Albany's uncle; he had left James IV at Flodden (some said even had slain him); and had allowed Norham castle to be rebuilt. Angus, being younger, was more popular and had powerful connections through his marriage. Forman 'though neither by friendship nor by blood was to be feared, yet by reason of his great riches would cary great sway to whatsoever syde he enclyned'. Hepburn singled out Hume by working diligently 'to stirr upp as often as he could, men to complayne of his wronges, some true, some false, but being many they seemed all true' and so impressed Albany 'to such an extent that his mind was closed'.

When Hume, Angus and the Queen fled to England, realising what was in the wind, Angus made representations from there to his brother-in-law Louis about Albany. The five clauses of Louis's reply are reproduced in the manuscript. When Albany gave fair promises Angus and Hume returned to Scotland. Not so the Queen who remained in England for a year or more, during which time Angus became enamoured of the daughter of the laird of Traquhair. 'This was ane injurie beyond degrie of reconcilment as hir Majestie thought' (p.249) and aided and abetted by the Archbishop of Glasgow who, anxious for vengeance for the removal of the Great Seal and to diminish the Earl's reputation among the people, 'did add new fewall to hir already begune fyre' and persuaded her to 'intend a process of devorce against him'. Meantime, Hume having been summoned and not compearing was denounced as a rebel and his moveables seized. Outraged at this, he plundered Dunbar, the Governor's 'cheiffe resort'. All this detail is omitted from the book. Then Hume 'setts to worke the Borderers', to which Albany responded in person with a thousand horsemen. Unequally matched, Hume remitted and was entrusted to his brother-in-law, the earl of Arran, who was persuaded by Hume to join his faction and supplant Albany, Arran being next in line to the throne. 'And both by letter of thair familiars, kinred and acquaintances as also privatt meittings with other

noblemen straiue to mak stronge and increase their factione'. The Governor, having won Glasgow Castle, marched to Hamilton Castle with the intention of taking it, only to be met by his aunt the old countess of Arran who despite her age, according to the manuscript, threw herself at his feet. 'His anger conquered by peitie and compasione' he was persuaded by her to make a peace treaty with her son. After a general reconciliation all bygones were pardoned except for Lord Hume who was pardoned conditionally, that if he was not obedient in future all his former crimes would be laid to his charge. Trusting the Governor's word he and his brother appeared at a convention - only to be apprehended and accused of the king's slaughter. 'No other crymes but those that were newly forgiven to lay to his charge', for which he and his brother were executed, and his lands dispoed to de la Beauté, a great favourite of the Governor. There follows an extended passage of sarcasm, 'This is the Governor's great wisdom, truth and honest dealing...'. But the point is made that the Governor was not aware that by so doing he was advancing Angus, since most of Hume's followers 'gave their onely dependance to him' whereby 'his forces and authoritie was much encreased'.

The killing of de la Beauté is merely noted in the book (p.244); in the manuscript it is detailed: 'Remembering the late execution of his chief and cousoin and finding him (de la Beauté) withall to be rydeing

uppon a notable good horse that was well known to have been Lord Hume's, he answered de la Beauté snappishlie and that in such manner that his brethren and other defenders hereing the same, they pull out their swords'. De la Beauté 'trusting chieflie to his horses speed which being laded with a great French bitt and other furniture of that kind ... stumbled to the ground ... was slaine by one of Wedderburn's men'. This is very similar to the account given in Latin in Hume's family history.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the quarrel between Arran and Angus, the book states the cause of the hatred 'we hear not' (p.244). In the manuscript it is suggested it was perhaps to do with the siege of Langton. Both book and manuscript exculpate Angus: the book by saying had the attack on Ferniehurst been directed by Angus, he would hardly have gone lightly armed to Edinburgh; the manuscript says Angus sent his nephew Camnethen to prevent James Hamilton interfering. The resulting fight in Edinburgh between Arran and Angus is similarly described in both, the only difference being the additional information in the manuscript that Angus's proclamation was merely a response to an earlier one by Hamilton giving all Douglasses two hours to depart the town. When Albany returned from France in 1521 the manuscript goes into much more detail about his treatment of Angus: 'he calls a parliament to which Angus and his friends were chardged to compeare' before being sent to

France and his uncle Gavin Douglas, bishop of Dunkeld, to Rome. There follows a lengthy passage in the manuscript detailing the literary ability of Gavin Douglas. This is mentioned much earlier in the book but given greater detail in the manuscript, e.g. with reference to his translation of Virgil; (p.220) book eight of the Prologues in particular, whereas in the manuscript books seven, eight and twelve are all quoted. There is also a critique of his style, 'not base but high and sublime and noe ways affected'. In the book Angus is merely sent to France (p.248), whereas in the manuscript it is by intercession of the Queen his wife 'although they were not in great friendship'.

While in France Angus used his influence with the king to write to Albany to preserve the lives and estates of his friends 'that thair should non of the earls friends be trubled during his absence. To which the Duke agreitt'. He also offered his and his brother's service to Francis 'what service the earls of Douglas and duke of Turran thair ancestors had done to his Majestie's predecessors' and was given the Order of St Michael 'til be amongst the honorable fraternitie of uthir prencis and nobilitie of France'. His younger brother was granted a yearly pension of a thousand crowns. At the earl's death both this order and letter of pension 'being in ane velvett box he caused put them in the Charter Chest'.

Much more is made in the manuscript of Angus's sojourn in England at the request of Henry VIII and Henry's offer of men and ammunition to get rid of Albany 'that peace mayth be the better preserved betwixt the nations'.

Regarding the divorce there is a difference in emphasis: in the book the Queen sued for divorce on grounds of a precontract between Angus and the daughter of Traquair (p.249) in the manuscript because the Queen was associating with Ochiltree's younger brother and Angus wanted male heirs, he confessed, and they were divorced with the reservation that their child should not be disadvantaged. Not surprisingly Henry VIII 'resentit it mightily', stating 'some things tolerable in men ... were shameful in woman'. But the Queen 'made little reckening' for she then married Henry Stewart and Angus later married Margaret Maxwell.

The triumvirate of Angus, Argyle and Lennox which replaced the Governor fell apart on account of Angus 'drawing all to himself'. The book cites the example of his appointment of his brother William to the abbacy of Holyroodhouse (p.250). The manuscript cites in addition his appointment of his cousin James Douglas of Parkhead to be captain of the king's guard, his uncle Archibald Douglas of Kilspindie to be Treasurer and his brother Sir George to be Chamberlain. However, according to the manuscript, it was the Blackadder incident 'whereof altho' the earle was innocent yett did itt much derogatt



to his reputation amongst the common people'. Remarkably the book (p.251) gives a fuller account of the incident than the manuscript, e.g. in the latter there is no mention of the tavern scene.

The account of the attempt of Buccleuch to take the king from Angus has the addition in the manuscript of a speech by Angus to his followers. Both sources (p.253) agree this was the beginning of the Ker/Scott feud.

Details of the battle of Linlithgow Bridge, in particular the delaying tactics of the king, are set out in the book (p.255) as well as George Douglas's words to the king: 'It is as much as our lives are worth if our enemies get you from us this day, which rather than they shall do we will hold fast one half of you, and let them pull away the other'. In the manuscript, it is quoted as 'Sir, if your Majestie will no wiser goe on, in a swifter pace I will move you ... giving the King injurious words he never forgot nor forgave'. The abbey of Machlein in the book (p.255) is Manwall in the manuscript, the latter being more accurate.

The observation about private process and the author's view that men were not so malicious 'as our writers give out, or not so pregnant in the inventing of crimes and quarrels as men are nowadays' (p.256) has no equivalent in the manuscript. Archbishop Beaton, who had managed to keep hidden meanwhile, negotiated with George Hume when tempers had cooled, according to the manuscript, and

they agreed that the Archbishop should bestow some church benefices and tithes upon the earl and some of his friends. Upon these terms they were reconciled and the Archbishop did come to Falkland and 'thair with appearance of greatt friendship they mutually entertained and feasted each other. But small confidence could be long among reconciled enamis' is the cynical attitude the manuscript adopts.

The expedition of Angus to the Borders (p.256) is given in much greater detail in the manuscript.

Having putt all things on order for the weill and safetie of his Majestie, the earle went straight to the Kinge declaringe that he had receaved true informatione that the borderers from the east to the west was likely to stirr but especially Lidesdail for the which he desayred his Majestie advise therein who did impour his lordship to be Great Lieutenant of the south and wast part of Scotland and desyring his lordship that he should quayle the borderers that no insurectione mayth rysse for trubling of the kingdome.

The earl then met with 'divers of his friends' at Edinburgh, among whom was the Lord Maxwell with whom he arranged to marry his daughter Margaret Maxwell. The Lord Maxwell gave 'in touchare 5000 merks with five little piece of ordinance'. Also at this meeting occurred the stabbing of Sir James Hamilton by the former groom of the deceased earl of Lennox. This turned the Hamiltons against Angus.

After leaving Tantallon in the hands of his captain, having taken an inventory of the ordinance and ammunition and given him instructions, Angus went to the Merse and

met with his friends. An interesting omission from the book is the fact that according to the manuscript at this time he made the laird of Wedderburn his depute in the east Border and 'baillif of all his lands in the Merse for keeping of good order in those pairts. And next in pour to the Lord Houm'. The manuscript then goes on to list the borderers who joined Angus: 'the whole name of Rutherford, the lairds of Wachope, Minto, Badrule...'. From Liddesdale he went on to Langholm, Dumfries and Annan while his father-in-law Maxwell undertook to keep the west Border in order. The manuscript then goes on to describe the earl's marriage.

The opportunity taken by the young king to escape the control of Angus is detailed in the manuscript: the Archbishop of St Andrews corresponding with the king and his mother; the invitation to George Hume to go to St Andrews; the letter to the captain of the guard that his wife was dying; the disguise of the king as a groom and his posting to Stirling; and his letters to Athol, Glencairn, Huntly, Menteith, Argyll, Graham, Sinclair, Lindsay, Ruthven, Sempill, Eglinton, Rothes and in particular the Archbishop of St Andrews. In the book (p.257) it is merely a matter of the King 'goeth from Falkland to Stirling in the night with a few of his familiar servants' while Angus and his brother 'are both absent about the affairs of the country' (p.257). When the proclamation is made banishing the Douglasses, the

book comments on Angus's lack of wisdom in obeying: 'But where ruin is determined, wisdom is taken from the wisest and hearts from the hardiest'(p.257), whereas in the manuscript it is reported 'from Linlithgow the earle sentt ane speciall friend to his Majestie to say they had come to report on the great service they had done in the Borders, did not expect such a recompense as to be discharged without hearinge'.

Awaiting the meeting of the parliament which was to forfeit the Douglasses, Angus went to Tantallon where, according to the manuscript, he hid his papers 'thair being in the house ane extraordinarie hudg beiff pott of brasse whom the little kitchen boys that stirred the speitts was accustomed to lay in the fyre side for warmenes. The earle taking the evidents out of the Charter Chest and putting them all therein with the lide of the pott being closed with irone ... eirditt the pot under the little bridge hard adjacent to the fardest greatt yett'. There it remained until the king's death.

The attempts of Henry VIII to get Angus reinstated, in order to secure peace while he fought the Emperor, are dealt with at length in the manuscript. Details are given of the first attempt by Northumberland, then by D'Arcy followed by an attack on the Borders, after which Maxwell, being made Warden of the Marches, restored peace. Henry's attempt to meet with James is also detailed, with changes of place and date being suggested

on both sides to no avail. The political comment provided in the manuscript at this point is of interest, suggesting it was not just a five year peace and reinstatement of Angus that was involved: 'such of the nobilitie of the kingdom of Scotland who favoured the alteratione in religione desyred the king to keep the meeting, on the other hand the church ... persuading his Majestie (who was most religiously inclined) that it would give a terrible blow both to the estaitt of the kingdom and religion, the principal cause sayeth they why King Henry is so pationatly inclyned to have this meeting is to persuad his nephew to conforme church matters in Scotland... to abolish popish authority and to dryve religious persons from the land'. The failure to treat resulted in fact to war between Scotland and England, with an English force led by Sir Robert Bowes seconded by Angus and his brother, ravaging the country near the boundary until put to flight by Lord Hume. The detail of how Angus was nearly captured is also provided in the manuscript, together with the descriptions of the battles of Fala Muir and Solway Moss. After Solway Moss and the desertion of the nobility, the king in disgust determined to call home the earl of Angus but died before he could effect it. However, the earl with the rest of the Douglasses returned with the prisoners taken at Solway Moss on condition that they prosecute Henry's plan for the marriage of the young Mary to Edward. 'The king

gave to Sir George Douglas 50,000 angelles at his partinge to be distributed at his discesion to such of the nobilitie as had greatest credit to further this great bussiness'. Also mentioned in the manuscript is the king's meeting with John Major, then master of the 'New College' of St Andrews, 'a man much noted for his learning and science in chronologie in those days' to discuss making livings for James's base children at the expense of the nobility. Major suggested 'many church livings lying vacant or held by those who were a scandal to religion and they should be suspended', whereupon his son James was made prior of St Andrews, John abbot of Kelso and Coldingham, and Robert abbot of Holyrood.

Cardinal Beaton's reaction to the return of the Douglasses is the same in both accounts although in the manuscript is added, 'the Cardinal as was thought contrived a later will for the late king with the Queen's allowance'. However, he was warded in Dalkeith where he remained during the parliament which made Arran governor. As soon as he was able, he arranged for the English ambassador Sadler 'to be abused in Edinburgh by base fellowes thereby to irritate and provoke him to give occasion of the breach of conditions'. Sadler had been reminding the nobility of the condition of their release 'inducing all with the sweetnes of peace soe necessarie at that tyme for Scotland'. Gilbert, earl of Cassillis,



is cited as an example of one who, realising he could not perform what he had promised, returned to England where his two brothers were left as pledges for him.

In the ensuing Regency, the Cardinal was the directing force. He 'knows Arran to be timerous... easie to be governed especially by his base brother John Hamilton Abbot of Pasley' and, according to the manuscript, an agreement was made at Auldliston renouncing the 'Heads of Religion', and to follow the French faction. The Queen Mother was to keep the Queen who was then crowned - 'this was the Cardinall's devyse'. Whereupon Lennox, who had had hopes of marriage to the young Queen, joined Angus and the English faction. The reason for Lennox not triumphing at Linlithgow, although according to the manuscript he had 10,000 men, was the delaying tactics of the Cardinal, knowing that Lennox's army would not remain long together being volunteers. The English navy which came to the assistance of Angus and his faction was, according to the manuscript, under cover of going to Boulogne.

Regarding the marriage of Lennox to Lady Margaret Douglas, the manuscript makes it clear that she could have married the Duke of Savoy but Henry, aware that he was going to leave to a 'third wyfes bairnes the crown of England which other princes might perhappes think unlawful, he thought it best to marry her that way, whereby her posteritie should not be able to claim the

crown thereafter'. It then goes on to say she had three sons, the second of whom married Mary and produced James and his son King Charles, 'who now reignes over the whole Iland where may he and his posteritie with the sune and moone remain unchangeable'.

Two documents are referred to in the manuscript at this point: a charter whereby Angus granted half the lands of Cormackweye in Douglasdale in which he is styled 'Comes Angus dominus Douglasi locum tenens Regni Scotia ex australi parte aqua de Forth'; and a precept dated 1545 whereby in addition to his other privileges and possessions he was 'greatt lieutenant of the south and east marches of Scotland fornent Ingland'. Whereas in the book it is stated that de Large was empowered to bestow the order of St Michael on Angus, the Governor, Huntly and Argyle for their efforts against the English, it is pointed out in the manuscript that Angus and his brother had been honoured previously when in exile in France (see above).

The killing of Cardinal Beaton at this time, merely mentioned in the book (p.270), is elaborated in the manuscript: 'the Cardinall was slaine in the castle of St Andrews by Norman Lesly, elder sone to the earle of Rothes assisted by the lairds of Grange and Ballmedie. The Leslie's quarrel with him concerned the restoring of the laird of Easterweemes and the laird of Cleigh, the laird of Grange for taking the Treasurership from his

father, and Balmedie for some lands which he alledgitt the Cardinall had against all reasone taken from him'. There is no mention of religion.

Regarding the battle of Pinkie and the letter from Protector Somerset, the book gives as the reason for its suppression the fact that his Council of War 'puffed up the Governor with idle hope of a sure victory' (p.272). The manuscript, using the same words, gives a different explanation: 'Hugh Rigg of Carberry a lawyer by his calling and more remarkable for the high mass and foolish strength of his bodie than for his skill in matters of warfare. This man puffed up with some idle hopes of victory and for saveing of his little Toure house of Carberry which was threatened to be thrown down by the English advised the letter should be suppressed from the sight of the nobilitie'. The conduct of the battle is described in detail in both book (p.273) and manuscript. When Angus was ordered by the Governor to move faster the manuscript adds, 'some say he was commanded to move faster under the paine of treason'.

After the defeat at Pinkie the book (p.273) makes the point that the Queen Mother was pleased to see the disgrace of the Hamiltons as a consequence, and the excuse to call in the French. The manuscript details the size of the foreign army sent by Henry II of France: 3000 Germans, 2000 Frenchmen and 1000 horsemen led by an Italian. The returning ships took the young Mary to

France although 'many of the nobilitie withstood it'. The reader is then referred to Buchanan, folio 555. The manuscript then goes on to describe the trouble at home: the murder of William Crichton by Lord Sempill in the Governor's own chamber; the execution of innocent men under the colour of justice; the justice ayres 'pretending punishment of theeves but in effect for extortion of money from honest men'. This added to the Governor's unpopularity and left the way open for the Queen Mother to replace him. 'She had procured the King of France to move the matter to the Governours frendes and speciallie to his sone and many benefits besydes were offered him', e.g. his son was made Captain of the Scots Gendarmes in France; and he was made Duke of Châtelherault 'with faire promises besydes for the time to come'. 'Had he sought further it had not been refused. At any price was the Queen Mother to buy the dominance of the French in Scotland'.

After the proclamation limiting a man's household, when Angus accompanied by a thousand horse had dialogue with the Queen Mother, the actual words (p.274) quoted vary, but the manuscript has an additional dialogue on the subject of his 'lades of Douglas' being armed. The reference to the Queen Mother's desire to have Tantallon is elaborated in the manuscript by the story of how the Countess refused to hand it over since it was part of her dowry. Also recounted in the manuscript is the Queen

Mother's and Council's attempt to ward Angus in Edinburgh. But, arriving with all his 'lades of Douglas' plus everyone he met of his acquaintance on the way, he was told by the constable he could not be received in that way. Whereupon he said he had offered himself but had been refused. There is also reference in the manuscript to his diverse meetings with the Lord Wardens of England 'for calling of billes on either side and repairing of steallys according to the border lawes'. Finally the manuscript gives details of his death from St Anthony's Fire, his last conversation with the 'Goodman of Aitkenhead' and appointment of his brother-in-law Drumlanrig to be his executor.

Having no male heirs and his brother George of Pittendreich predeceasing him, Angus was succeeded by George's son David, who was earl for only a year before being succeeded by his son Archibald. The manuscript, however, goes into considerable detail in delineating the Pittendreich pedigree. The other more interesting fact is further reference to the thousand crowns annuity given to George by the king of France during his exile which 'in those dayes was of greater value than six thousand at present', the letter being still extant in the Charter Chest, subscribed with his Majesty's own hand and by his secretary l'Aubespain.

Since Archibald was only two years of age, David's brother James Douglas, earl of Morton, was his guardian. It is explained in the manuscript how George's son James got the title: how the third earl of Morton was restored with the help of Angus and his brother George, and how George used his money to make sure the title went to his son who was married to the earl of Morton's daughter. 'Sir George not losing time did deall with the earl of Morton and his friends in a fair way for disponing of the whole estait ... great sommes of money which Sir George gave both to the earl and be way of redeeming divers woodsetts of land ... it is to be remembered that Sir George got from Henry VIII 50,000 crowns ... and its thought he mad use of a part of it for the earldom of Morton...'. The 'distraction' of James's wife Elizabeth was obviously hereditary since James's father-in-law is variously referred to in the manuscript as 'weak-minded', 'daft' and 'idiot'. Her 'distraction' is used as an excuse for her husband's waywardness.

Regarding James there is no mention in the manuscript of his pseudonyms 'James the Grieve'(p.278) and 'James Innes' while living in fear of the king, James V. It is pointed out in the book (p.278) that the skills learned while he 'lurked' as grieve were to stand him in good stead later: economy and thrift and knowledge of the common people were to help him build up the earldoms of Morton and Angus and 'augment the revenues of crown and



kingdom'. To strengthen the position of himself and his nephew in relation to the claim of Lady Margaret Douglas to the earldom of Angus, which is mentioned in the book, he sent a letter to Henry II of France sending back the Order of St Michael, and according to the manuscript hoping to get it for himself and asking for a settlement of Lady Margaret Douglas's claim. It is stated 'he was answered in fayre genualls but could get nothing effectuated in regards he was of the new religion'. That method failing, he contracted his nephew to marry d'Oysel's daughter. That too came to nothing but the matter was resolved on Morton's visit to England after the siege of Leith in 1560. It is also suggested in the book, although not mentioned in the manuscript, that Morton was one of the group of nobles who went to England to ask for Elizabeth's assistance against the French after his attempt to keep peace between the Lords of the Congregation and the Queen Mother. 'Notwithstanding hee was become one of the new religion yet desirous that his owne partie might freely increase without trouble in the state he travailed to make peace betwixt those of that faction (called the Lords of the Congregation) and the Queen Regent. Her Majesty being carefull for the mayntenance of the Catholique religion and the others for the overthrowing thereof'. The action of Argyle and Lord James Stewart en route to Edinburgh from Stirling 'pulling down the Churches which in those days were

esteemed as godly and stately buildings as anie in Christendome' provoked the Queen Mother to get help from France. Morton's advice was, according to the manuscript, 'to graunte libertie of conscience for preventing thereby the great disorder and mischief which might ensue'. But since this was to no avail, he joined the Lords of the Congregation and according to both sources (p.280) subscribed the Book of Discipline.

With the arrival of Queen Mary in Scotland the manuscript lists the 'twelve counsellors of the nobilitie by whose advice she should govern the kingdom'. It then goes on to detail decisions that were taken at that time, e.g. 'that the beneficed men of the Catholic Church should possess two partes of theire living during theire lifetye and that the whole third part should be for the sustaining of the ministrie and what rested should come to the Queen's use'. Morton with Argyle, James Stewart and Lethington were appointed 'to modifie the ministers stipends which they made 300 merks at the most'. Both book (p.281) and manuscript emphasise the friendship of Moray and Morton but the book omits the episode quoted in the manuscript of Arran's plot to kidnap Mary and kill Moray. The enmity of Huntly to Moray, apart from the religious difference, is explained in the book (p.281) as envy of Moray's and Morton's success in the Borders which so enhanced his reputation; in the manuscript it is explained as Huntly wanting back Moray's title. The

episode of the Queen's journey north, the plot against Moray and Morton and the battle of Corrichie are similarly described in both.

Regarding Mary's marriage to Darnley, the accounts are very similar with that in the book (p.286) adding that Hamilton and Moray 'thought it not fit to conclude anything without the Queen of England's consent' and the manuscript adding that Mary's reason for bringing back Darnley was 'in case he should marry with some of the great families of England ... might be a block in hir way in the right of hir succession to England'. It also states how the Bishop of Dunblane was sent to get a dispensation from the Pope because of their kinship with the added comment that Sir Nicholas Throckmorton was sent by Elizabeth to command Darnley 'to retourne into England under the paine of barratrie.... But whether this was done for the fashion... or if she was indeed offended... I will not dispute'. The resentment of the nobility at Darnley's title is expressed in both sources (p.287) and the episode of the Hamilton flight described in the one as the 'Runabout Rode' (p.287) in the other as the 'Chaseabout Road'.

Although there is much detail in the book concerning David Rizzio, even more is added in the manuscript: his background 'his father kept a song-school... he came to Scotland with M. de Morett the ambassador of Savoy... a good voice to sing at the Queen's mass'. Described in

the book (p.288) as Cabinet Secretary to the Queen, the manuscript adds 'hir Majesty's privat missives and almost all forraine affayres came to his hand'. Maitland's double dealing is explained as trying to force Morton's hand to act against Rizzio. And again the Lennox claim to the earldom of Angus was used as bait. Whereas the book (p.289) says, 'Rizzio forgot his duty to the King and carried himself so insolently towards him', the manuscript states: 'the king began to waxe jealous being informed by some pick-thankes of David's being in the Queen's chamber at houres inconvenient'. But the fact that Rizzio was using his influence against the banished lords to get parliament to forfeit them expedited his death. The intention was apparently to take Rizzio to the tolbooth, have him tried and publicly executed but the noise made by Huntly and Bothwell escaping was misinterpreted as a rescue attempt and called for instant action. The King's words to the Queen are quoted indirectly in the book (p.290), in direct speech in the manuscript. But the manuscript goes on to report Ruthven's speech to the Queen desiring the Queen to be governed by her nobility, who had a stake in the country rather than 'base knaves and strangers whoe had nothing to lose nor pledges to give for their fidelitie'. The Queen's reply about revenge is also given. As the Chaseabout Raid banished lords returned so the murderers of Rizzio were forced to flee, as 'the Queen easily

persuaded the King to abandon his faction' and he 'agreed with her to take the lives of such of the nobilitie and gentlemen as she thought were enemies to her'. According to the mansucrypt, 'this inconstancie procured his ruine'.

Morton with his accomplices fled to England but was soon restored through the good offices of the new favourite, Bothwell. According to the book (p.292), 'all men followed him, all preferment came by him'. Also in the book (p.293) at this point there is a lengthy philosophical passage typical of Hume, reflecting on the situation in which Morton found himself: 'To sit on the shoare and behold others at sea tossed with winde and wave...' and again, reflecting on the Queen, 'my heart inclineth more to pity...'. The manuscript, however, gives an account of Bothwell's rise, as well as more detail of the murder, subsequent marriage and the division of the nobility in consequence. However, it adds, 'the burroughs being stirred upp by the ministers favoured the lords... sent to the Queen asking her to dissociate with Bothwell... the lords resolve to take Bothwell from her... and put him to assize'. The point is made in both sources (p.297) that Sir David Hume of Wedderburn, the historian's father, was on the side of Mary although his kin, Lord Hume and the earl of Morton, were on the other side. The battle of Carberry is described fully in the book and in particular the

incident regarding the Wedderburn servant at the well (p.296) which is related in the Wedderburn family history.<sup>6</sup> Regarding the personal challenge which Bothwell offered and which was taken up by Lindsay, the Queen's words are quoted in the manuscript: 'Noe, my heart, you are my husband, you shall not fight with anie of them, come and speke with me'. The manuscript also adds: 'the lords... used most hard speeches to her both in the field and all the way as they conducted her to Edinburgh'. During the consultation about what to do with Mary, the manuscript quotes John Knox, 'being then with the lords who thought if she lived the religion would not take root, opened himself with great vehemence to the earl of Morton and that in very hot and uncomely terms, saying "thou forbiddes the sword of justice to strike where God biddes it strike and therefore thou thyself shalbe strooken with the sword which now thou sparest".' This is reported anonymously in the book (p.298). In the manuscript the reason for Mary being sent to Lochleven is given 'because Edinburgh was in the hands of James Balfour who was made capten thereof by the earl of Bothwell'. It also states (which the book does not) that 'it was at this time Bothwell sent to Balfour for a little casket of silver which was in his custodie. The caskett did first appertaine to Francis II the Queen's first husband and was given by hir to the earl of Bothwell. In it were found many letters without date or



subscription alleadged to have been wryten by the Queen and past betweene hir Majestie and the earl of Bothwell whereof the most materiall were thought to have been wryten by the earl of Huntlie's hand'. Bothwell's flight to Shetland and escape to Denmark, with the help of the Bishop of Orkney, is described in both sources (p.301) together with Morton 'hyring both men and ships' at his own expense to pursue him. Morton's efforts to keep the lords together are also described in both, but in the manuscript is added 'the lords faction had utterly decayed if the the earl of Morton had not taken extraordinary travell and layed out great sumes of his owne'. When James was crowned, 24 July 1567, the causes of Mary's demission are given in the manuscript as '1) weariness of body and mind 2) love to her sonne 3) to prevent evil willers that might make impediment'. The role of Maitland in Mary's escape is stressed in both book (p.301) and manuscript, his previous opposition being based on hatred of Bothwell and later support based on dislike of Murray. On the subject of Mary's escape the manuscript adds the connivance of old Lady Lochleven putting 'wedges in the rowlocks of the other boats'. Thereafter both book (p.304) and manuscript coincide in the account of the battle of Langside 'as I have heard it of those that were present'.

Regarding the letters from Elizabeth and the Regent Moray's subsequent journey to England, the manuscript gives much more of an explanation:

they, unwilling to acknowledge the least authoritie of aine commission sent from the Queen of England in whatsoever busines concerning the state of Scotland, yet fearing agayne that by ther owne Queen's procurement they might be invaded by foraine enemies, thought it not best to offend that Queen by a refusal: and that so much the rather because she had promised in hir letters that if they might prove that their causes of takeing armes were sufficient shee wuld also approve them, the lords therefore willing to have the Queen of England on their syde for the better resisting of whatsoever evill might fall out they deemed that for hir better satisfaction the Regent himself should goe in person'.

The suggestion from England that Mary should be allowed to live as a private individual is common to both sources (p.307), but regarding Mary's request for divorce, more explanation is given in the book (p.307) as to why there should be no hurry, the possibility of marriage to Norfolk being a real danger. It is also suggested that Elizabeth was indebted to the Regent for pacifying the Borders and capturing the duke of Northumberland, and this strengthened the Regent's position which in turn led to the plot to murder him. In the manuscript one is given more detail about the background to the murder 'James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh being highly discontented from the Regent's not restoring him to his house and lands of Woodhouseley offers himself to be the man and resolves to shut him with a piece'. Since the Regent was going from Edinburgh to Stirling and then to

Glasgow to deal with Lord Fleming concerning the delivery of Dumbarton Castle, James Hamilton lay in wait in both Stirling and Glasgow to no avail. 'But fynding no occasion there, he determined upon Lithgow'. The manuscript also gives details of how the plan was actually executed. There follows an assessment of Murray's qualities with the additional comment: 'Howsoever some did give out and alledge that he made only a cloake of religion and so under that pretext did spoyle and destroy the churches of Scotland... By the which spoyle that he did both enrich himself and his friends'. The book (p.310) emphasises the point that while Moray was regent Morton was his helpmate: 'Morton did many things without Murray, but Murray nothing without Morton', and tends to eulogise Morton, maintaining it was not self-interest but love of the young king, preservation of religion, and welfare of his country that motivated him to stand firm when so many others were going over to the Queen's cause. The role of Maitland in delaying the calling of a Convention is omitted from the manuscript.

The background to the choice of Lennox as Regent is given in the manuscript: 'the king's partie sends Robert Pitcairn... to the Queen of England with letters for the homecoming of Lennox and desiring hir assistance against the Queen's partie and offering their goodwill to hir service against hir rebels, promising with all for hir

better assurance to choose them a Regent by hir advise, upon which the earl of Lennox comes home and they procure of his Majestie a thousand horse and 300 footmen under the conduct of Sir William Drury'. The manuscript also states that the English 'made a mutine for want of pay... the journey should have had an bad issue had not the earl of Morton provided for money'. 'Loth to offend Queen Elizabeth', Lennox was made interregent until July 12th. But letters from Elizabeth saying she would not meddle confirmed Lennox's position. All the while, according to the manuscript, the French and Spanish ambassadors were importuning Elizabeth to help Mary. The Scottish nobility, aware of this and anxious to keep her goodwill, went to England to plead their cause before her anew, represented by Morton and Pitcairn, in the book (p.315) at Elizabeth's desire, in the manuscript 'by advise and consent of parliament'. Then the manuscript recounts Morton's proposals for settling the kingdom: Argyle, Huntly, Hume and Herries to be given as hostages and the castles of Hume and Dumbarton to be given to England for three years; then the Queen's party's proposals that the young king should be sent to England. Each party's proposals were unacceptable to the other. The manuscript then stated that the Regent gave the gift of the Archbishopric of St Andrews to Morton, which he bestowed on his cousin Mr John Douglas, provost of 'New College' and rector of the University of St Andrews.

The reference to both sides holding a parliament warrants the comment in the manuscript that 'the Queen's parliament was holden with noe manner of formalitie. For there was no due proclamation nor lawful summoning and two bishops sent their votes in writing. The like whereof was never practised before'.

The battles of Craigmillar and Gallowlaw in June 1571 are detailed in both sources (p.317) but the capture of Lord Hume is given more fully in the manuscript. He was brought to Leith where all his friends who were with the earl of Morton came and visited him. Amongst them was Sir David Hume of Wedderburn<sup>7</sup> 'who came to the earl of Morton, showing him his kindly affection to his friend without prejudice of the cause, and promising to recall him from the contrary faction requesting the Earl that he would be pleased to sett him at libertie and suffer him to dwell in his own house where he should remaine without any further medling against the king. But the earl of Morton nothing pleased with this notion would not consent thereto but sent him to Tantallon to be kept'.

Again there is reference in the manuscript to two parliaments and in particular the Queen's parliament in Edinburgh held by Huntly and Arran: 'as for commissioners of boroughs there were none at all except such as favoured them within the town. In this parliament they forfeited the number of two hundred persons. Amongst whome manie were pupills within age, others peaceable men

not meddling with either partie'. It is also pointed out that at the Regent's parliament in Stirling began the controversy over the place of bishops. In the manuscript it is stated that the ministers petitioned parliament 'but could obtayne noe more than had been provided for them before because the King's house not being sufficiently furnished that which they required was dedicate to that use'. Similarly it is stated there that 'the ministers did convene at a generall assemblie wherein was ordained that bishops should be established to possess their rents and livings but should have no power or Jurisdiction over the ministers such as bishops had in the Catholic church'. Whereas in the manuscript it is stated 'one amongst the ministers exclaimed against Morton', in the book he is identified as Patrick Adamson and the Tulchan Bishop speech is recounted.

According to the manuscript 'Capitaine Calder slew both the Regent and Wormiston by one (and the same) shott of a pistoll'. The death of Regent Lennox is then described. The book (p.322) merely states he received his 'death's wound'. When referring to the choice of a successor, the book (p.322) comments on the appearance of Argyle on the list: 'It is strange...'. The manuscript goes on to say 'it was thought that the earl of Argyle, being so late an enemy was onely put in with the other two (Mar and Morton) least he might have continued discontentment... they are all three sworn that whosoever



shalbe chosen shall accept of it and the other two obey and assist him'. The book maintains Morton helped bring about the choice of Mar. The manuscript then goes on to describe the trouble caused in the North by Huntly's brother Adam Gordon and the siege of Glenbervie castle, whereas the book (p.323) concentrates on Morton's handling of the Borders' unrest: how he sent for 'the chief gentlemen of the Merse to get them to subscribe to a bond whereby they would assist the Warden Sir James Hume of Coldinknowes' but Sir David Hume of Wedderburn refused to sign because Turnbolls, Rutherfords and the laird of Bedrule were included who were notorious thieves. Surprisingly this episode is not mentioned in the manuscript, rather that 'the south borders also comitted great disorder but they were repressed by the Lord Ruthven who was sent thither for that effecte'.

When Regent Mar died in October 1572 Morton was chosen to succeed him by 'uniform consent'. The book then goes on to describe the reason for the choice quoting again Mr Thin and concluding: 'he did neither ambitiously seek the place nor got it by faction but was chosen to it for the good of the country'. On the other hand it is stated in the manuscript 'in playne terms that he was a man very unpartiall'.

The continuing struggle between the two factions and siege of Edinburgh which commenced under Mar's regency and continued after a short truce in Morton's, is

detailed in both sources (p.326) with the manuscript providing additional information: 'Now victualls were at a great rate amongst them, there was no aile at all: they were constrayned to drink water and veinegaire and the most parte of them but water alone'. The calling in of the ambassadors to negotiate a truce at Edinburgh's request is modified by 'as some say' in the manuscript. When fighting resumed the help that was given by England at Morton's request is stated in both sources as 700 men, although the book refers to Mr Thin's allegation that there were 1,500. The manuscript adds that Holinshed alleges this figure as well.

In the manuscript the Five Acts of 1572 are described as the "speciall acts touching religion" which Morton 'did so execute that no man durst professe any religion in Scotland but the new religion which was then called the reformed and is now called the protestant religion'. The book (p.329) quotes the Acts in full, the manuscript does not. Morton in both sources is stated to be responsible for these, as well as restoring peace in the Borders and the Highlands, but most of all for establishing peace amongst the nobility.

Both sources (p.332) refer to Carmichael and Auchinleck (Affleck in the manuscript) as warden and steward respectively, but the book (p.332) goes on to add 'they did their dewtie to the earle their master and did also make large gains to themselves by thair offices'.

Although the book makes no mention of it, the manuscript describes at length the pursuit and capture of Black Ormiston one of the murderers of the Regent. Regarding Lord Hamilton and his brother Claude, also accounted authors or accessories to the murders of the two Regents, in the book (p.332) they made 'publick obeysance to Archibald Earl of Angus in the palace of Holyroodhouse'; in the manuscript there is the verbatim copy of a bond they made with him, in particular absolving them of the killing of Angus's servant Westraw. The importance of this bond is denoted by the fact that it is quoted in full and reflects the reconciliation of two important power blocks. This reconciliation, however, was not at all popular, especially with the relatives of the murdered Regents whose deaths the King's side had sworn to avenge.

Morton then incurred further unpopularity with his stand on bishops and the appointment of Patrick Adamson, the dialogue with the General Assembly being reported in both sources (p.334). The manuscript goes on to state that about this time Andrew Melville met Morton by chance and challenged him that there was no justification for bishops in scripture. To which the Regent replied that he was the Prince's curator and could not be answerable to him when he came of age if he abolished one of the estates.

The behaviour of Auchinleck in particular and the Regent and his servants in general caused widespread resentment: to see them 'ingross all matters of profit and advantage to themselves alone'. The book (p.335) goes into detail: 'The marriages of wards, the gifts of escheats, reabbling or naturalisation were bestowed all upon his domesticks...'. It then catalogues a whole series of grievances as well as people who were alienated, e.g. James and Alex Hume, Argyle and Ker. Even the earl of Angus had his own discontents and thought him 'too careful to prefere and provide for his natural sons and not so careful of him as he should have been'. In addition to those he had offended, there were his sworn enemies, e.g. John Maitland, Sir Robert Melville and the bishops of Glasgow and Ross who 'hunted for all the advantages against him they could devise'.

Thereafter the accounts in book (p.340) and manuscript are virtually identical, dealing with the Redswire incident and then Morton's demission, the only difference being the reference in the book to the killing of Lord Glamis and the ensuing feud between the families of Glamis and Crawford. There is also reference in the book (p.344) only to the incident mentioned in Hume's family history when Lord Hume was reinstated largely by the representations of George Hume, when the latter made the

famous remark about his chief: 'if his chief should turn him out at the fore-door, he would come in again at the back door'.

Regarding the return of the king to Edinburgh from Stirling both book (p.345) and manuscript refer to his popularity and the parliament he held, but the manuscript goes on to add that he made Acts 'for establishing and ordering of religion, keeping the Sabbath day, care of the young beyond seas, the use and having of Bibles and psalme books'. Both sources (p.346) go on to recount the beginning of Morton's fall with the arrival of D Aubigny 'sent hither of sett purpose ... on work against the earl of Morton', culminating in James Stewart's accusation that Morton was 'art and part of the murder of King Henry'. James Stewart's background is described in the manuscript plus the fact that he was soon raised to be Lord Hamilton earl of Aran and Captain of the King's Guard.

The last days of Morton including his trial and execution are dwelt on at length in both sources (p.352) with some additional details in the manuscript: 'they could hardly find any just cause against him. To absolve him was contrary to their plotted course and offensive to the accuser who was now become a great man and whome to offend was no small danger'. The irregularity of the trial is emphasised in both sources, the manuscript adding, 'the earl of Arran travailled much

with the assizes, coming out and in to them many tymes after they were inclosed, which was against all order or custom, also he and Montrose had much talk aparte betwixt the doores'. Both (p.353) detail Morton's confession and describe his last hours, and end with an account of his abilities, wherein occurs an interesting deviation: in the book (p.357) 'he was well skilled as in politick government so in oeconomy from the shrub to the scepter from planting cabbage in his garden to the wielding of the sword and scepter in the seat of justice'; in the manuscript it is '... from shrub to cedar from the planting of coleworts in his garden to the wielding of the scepter'. It would appear that the latter is the original statement which has been misread and interpreted for the published version. Regarding the codifying of the laws which Morton had set in motion, the book (p.358) states when Morton demitted, Balfour and Skene 'left of any further proceeding in it', whereas the manuscript states Skene finished the work. Again, the book (p.359) has a moralising section on 'the uncertainty of corruptible riches' which the manuscript has not.

The chapter on Archibald, ninth earl of Angus is introduced in the book (p.361) with an account of his marriages and education. This information, other than the fact that he left St Andrews at seventeen and that his uncle kept a private tutor for him, is kept to the end of the chapter in the manuscript. There is,



however, an interesting insertion in the manuscript telling how the young earl wanted the lieutenancy of the Borders but Morton wanted him to stay at court and learn and gain experience. Angus complained 'to those of his friends closest to the Regent', e.g. Sir George Hume of Wedderburn, Douglas of Whittingham, Douglas of Maines and Douglas of Longniddrie saying he was 'not always to be esteemed a chyld' and desired of his uncle 1) an account of the earldom of Angus, 2) the disposing of Pittendreich, and the lands of Dolphinton, 3) giving a prebendrie in Abernethie, 4) the brass bot and 5) the Order of St Michael. The Regent answered he had made him earl of Angus; Pittendreich had never been part of Angus; he had put 'much broth' in the brass pot; and threatened not to give him Morton. He had added that he had intended making Angus the greatest man in the kingdom. 'All which particulars ... betwixt the Regent and Angus, Sir George Hume of Wedderburn<sup>8</sup> being ane speciall actor shew it at length to William earl of Angus that died in Paris at his coming to the Merse'. Angus maintained that Sir George was the only 'subject that moved the Regent noways to seperatt the earldom of Morton from Angus'. In gratitude Wedderburn was given 'the lands of Kimmergen altho' he had befor the lands of Kettellsheill and Dronsheill in Lamermure haldine of his lordship'. There is irony in the description of Angus as 'the good earl Archibald'. He was 'ane good sore earle for the

house of Angus' since he had given away his successors' inheritance. Also mentioned in this insertion is the fact that when Angus got the lieutenancy of the Borders he made a serious onslaught on the outlaws of the district - 'Lintoun Richisone and Mackbraine'.

The manuscript then goes on to detail the part Angus played in mediating in the dispute over the teinds of Langnewton between William Douglas of Lochleven and Andrew Ker, not mentioned in the book.

Both sources (p.361) concur in the description of the flight of Angus to England on the execution of his uncle, followed by his kindly reception by Elizabeth and association with the leading courtiers, in particular Sir Philip Sidney. The book (p.361) then goes on to describe the unpopularity of Arran and Lennox and the alienation of the burghs and both book and manuscript describe the quarrels between them.

The account of the Ruthven Raid in 1582 is detailed in both sources (p.366) with the additional information in the manuscript that, after his confinement, Arran was sent 'to Duplin a place of the lord Oliphant where he remayned some few days and was thereafter sett at libertie'. The book (p.366) on the other hand includes an episode involving David Hume the author 'who by chance was come thither' where Ballantine, having borrowed Hume's pistol considered shooting at the guard but was deterred by Hume. The book also makes it clear that

Angus was 'au fait' with what was going on and had moved north accordingly. The book (p.367) goes into greater detail about his return from England: how he stayed some time in Berwick until the English ambassadors interceded for him with the king. The manuscript gives the same facts in a more condensed form: how he was received by the king and would have lived a quiet life but for the division of the country by religion, which forced him to take sides and how the nobles whom he joined had prepared the way for his return. However, disagreement between Gowrie and Pitcairn caused Gowrie to 'take remission for the fact at Ruthven'. There is no mention in the manuscript of the fact that the king had promised Walsingham that Angus would be fully restored to his possessions. There is a discrepancy between book (p.369) and manuscript regarding Angus's subsequent confinement: 'beyond Forth' in the book, 'beyond Spey' in the manuscript, and also where he was alleged to meet Mar and Glamis: 'Auchnowshill' in the book, 'Woodhouselea' in the manuscript. But perhaps the most interesting discrepancy is the statement in the book (p.370) that Angus on his journey to Moray had 'none of his own followers with him save Robert Douglas of Cavers' whereas the manuscript states 'there were with the earl in this journey of chief men James Douglas of Torthorell and Sir George his brother, Archibald of Pittendreigh sone naturall to the Earl of Morton, Sir John Carmichael and

his sone Sir Hugh, with Mr David Hume brother to Sir George Hume of Wedderburn, besydes his other household officers'.

The whole episode of the discord between the ministers and the courtiers is omitted from the manuscript whereas the book (p.372) details the episode and includes Andrew Melville's 'Apology'. The imprisonment of the participants in the Ruthven Raid is, however, given in both sources (p.376) with the additional information in the manuscript that they were not to come within six miles of the King.

When David Hume was sent by Angus to assess and sound out Gowrie, he is not mentioned by name in the manuscript as he is in the book (p.377), but the account is given in the first person using the words 'I remember'. He is subsequently referred to as 'the gentleman'.

According to the book (p.379), the intention of Angus and his supporters was 'to convene with the nobility and barons who would hear their cause and inform the King truly', but the manuscript states they intended 'by a comon consent to frame a petition and send it to the King laying open their grievances and desyring with all submission and respect that his Majesty would put from him such wicked counsellors'. Gowrie, 'having trifled out the time' (p.380) was arrested at Dundee and his delay was immediately questioned by Angus who called for 'the gentleman' (David Hume) who had interviewed Gowrie

previously, and asked him for his interpretation of Gowrie's actions. This is recounted in both book (p.380) and manuscript and it is obvious from Hume's remarks that he knew Gowrie very well 'lingering was well known to be his natural disposition which he had often found by former experience' (p.381). The manuscript continues: 'Angus knew not whither to remayne wherefore there was noe remedie but to make a virtue of necessity (bonne mine en mauvais jeu)'. But 'hee did shew a fayre countenance ... expecting to heere what would become of the earl of Mar and Master of Glamis whom he knew by that tyme were returned out of Irland, haveing appointed the lord Torthorell his cousin with his friends and servants in Douglasdale to meet him at the laird of Lachops (Muirhead) and accompany them to Sterling'. The reply of Angus to the refusal of Lochleven's mother to let her son join them is repeated in both sources, but in the manuscript there is no mention of 'that which we intend for the good of his own church'. The Declaration of purpose of the Lords which follows is given in reported speech in the book but in the first person in the manuscript: '... wherefore we pray and exhort all such as tende the wealle of their countrie, the prosperous estate of theire king or that care for the safetie of religion that they concurre and ioyne with us in this common action and publick cause'. The reasons for the Lords' decision not to proceed is given in both sources (p.386),

but the episode of the capture and hanging of Archibald Douglas is given in much more detail in the manuscript: Douglas 'rydes rashly out alone at a contrary parte of the town (Lanark) where finding some of Johnston's companie attending, and thinking they had beene of the lords skouts returning of the town he rushed unadvisedly amongst them and was presentlie made prisoner and led to the laird of Johnston ... this unfortunate man, who not being missed till they retyred to the Harelawholme five miles from Lanark, and Johnston as many miles backward towards Edinburgh, there was no recovery of him'. The execution of Gowrie and the treatment of his lady is further commented on in the manuscript: 'avarice or crueltie or both in Arrane excluding all humanitie and respect that might move compassion or comiseration of hir so pittieful state'.

It is at this point that the order of events is reversed: the book (p.388) goes on to talk about the conduct of Arran and the passage of the Black Acts, whereas the manuscript continues the fortunes of Angus and the Lords. In the book (p.388) there is a detailed account of the reaction of the ministers to the establishment of bishops and in particular the dialogue between John Craig, John Brand and John Herries with the earl of Arran, culminating in the silencing of John Craig and the holding of a public fast. All this is omitted from the manuscript, which concentrates on the flight of



Angus. It lists the people who fled with Angus: Mar, Glamis, the Abbots of Cambuskenneth and Dryburgh, George Douglas of Parkhead, James Douglas, lord of Torthorell and his brother Sir George, his sons, Sir Alexander Hume of Manderston, the lairds of Carmichael, Carnock and Balwhane 'with divers other gentlemen of good sorte. There were also divers of the principalls of the ministerie turned out after them by the persecution of Captain James Stewart...' and the manuscript goes on to name them, as does the book.

The reason given in the manuscript for the move of the exiled lords from Berwick to Newcastle is stated as: 'these are all desired by the Queen of England to goe from Berwick to Newcastle and their to make their residence soe it was thought good by the state of England to secure and content the courtiers of Scotland by taking that thorn out of their foot' - the metaphor is used in both sources - '... and removing them from the borders where they lay (as it was given out) in wayte for some opportunity to trouble the country with factions and divisions'. The manuscript then goes on to state where the Lords stayed in Newcastle, 'being lodged all together in a goodly fayre house of a merchants in that town called Master Bridges'. It also describes a conversation they had 'in an afternoon talking merrilie together in a withdrawing chamber ... amongst other things they had some speech of pedigrees', whereas the

book (p.393) emphasises the kindness of Angus inviting the ministers to join them from Berwick and 'for a long time were wholly maintained by them'. In particular his sensitivity in dealing with the Abbot of Dryburgh is noted. It is also stated in the manuscript that they got an allowance from England: 'their English allowance was spare enough and oftentimes very slowly furnished unto them'. In the book (p.394) the description 'one with whom he was pleased to be familiar' and 'one whom he was pleased to use familiarly' can be taken to be David Hume, who then went on to London ostensibly to further his studies but on the understanding he would further their cause and correspond with Angus 'both concerning business as he could learn and other things, as he should also write to him upon occasion'. The reason given for this is distrust of John Colville. Unfortunately the correspondence 'was performed on both sides after such a secret way as they had agreed upon before their parting' so that the letters from Angus are not extant. In the book (p.395) at this point are included two letters from Hume to Angus, 'the only extant of many', with the editorial comment: 'the main business was written in such dark and unperceivable a manner that none could read it, but such as were acquainted with the ways thereof'. This is in fact no understatement.

The lords were then 'removed to Norwich from Newcastle and from there to London under the pretext of answering to such accusations as the King's Ambassador had to lay to their charge' according to the manuscript. But it adds: 'the true end was to confer with them of the meanes for their retourne unto their own countrie. And how to be rid of James Stewart earl of Arran who was become odious and hateful even to those that were partakers of court offices and preferments with him'. The second letter included in the book (p.398) pertains to March 1585 when the lords were at Norwich. It merely shows the author's function as spy: it refers to the ambassador's return to court 'upon occasion of letters which he received on Saturday at night: what they bear I have not yet learned'. An interesting reference within the letter (p.399) shows the seriousness even of communication with the exiles: 'my brother Wedderburn's servant who, being booted, confessed he had delivered him a letter from me'. There is also evident the opportunity for local feud. 'It (the capture of Wedderburn's servant) is done by Manderston to make it reflect upon my brother: and he to recriminate hath accused his son George'.

The trial of the rebels is recounted in both sources (p.401) but the point that is emphasised is the dissimulation: their accuser Ballantyne accusing 'with great vehemence and ardour' and yet all the while they

knew he was on their side 'and did conspire with them underhand for their restitution'. As for the English judges, they were aware of all that was going on and 'favoured their enterprises'. The book (p.401) emphasises the playing of roles: 'What masks and vizards men do put on sometimes to cloak their designs'. It then gives the example of the play acting when Angus met the ambassador in Tuttle fields - 'they acted their part ... like a stage play'.

The request of the Scots for a Scottish Church in England is omitted from the manuscript but the preaching of Andrew Melville is mentioned in both (p.402), the manuscript stating that Angus 'heard Andrew Melville almost every day reading a lecture of divinitie and expounding the scripture in Latin. And the Earl himself read diligently that translation of the bible of Junius and Tremelius newly then comed from the press'. But 'when they heard how all things were redie in Scotland' according to the manuscript 'they came to the Borders', where, as the book (p.402) but not the manuscript states, the murder of Sir Francis Russell made the wardens of the Middle Marches join with the lords. The letter Angus wrote to his friends in Scotland is included in the book (p.403) but not in the manuscript. Other than that the account of the lords' return is the same in both with a little added detail in the manuscript, such as the house where they met with Bothwell 'a house called the Fryars

belonging to the laird of Cessford'. However, a notable omission in the manuscript is the Declaration of the lords at Falkirk. Again the siege of Stirling Castle is dealt with similarly in both but with an account of the death of James Haldane in the book (p.406) but not in the manuscript, James Haldane being brother to John, both of whom were particular friends of David Hume. On the other hand the manuscript gives details of the activities of James Johnston of Westerhall, 'a special vassal and defender of the earl of Angus'.

The reception of the Lords on their return by the King is given special mention with his statement 'that it was the very hand of God which had prospered their enterprise' (p.408) and there is a very full description in both sources (p.408) of the plague, which ceased the minute the Lords entered Stirling. The book (p.409) goes on to elaborate the miraculous work of God bringing this to pass, as well as the overthrow of the Spanish Armada.

Both book (p.409) and manuscript emphasise the desire of Angus not to take revenge and also not to take rewards for himself and his friends; being content to take back only what was his own. The book goes on to say how he allowed young Lennox to retain Dalkeith until he got a suitable recompense, and at the king's request allowed Lennox the privilege of carrying the Crown, with himself, Angus, taking second place and carrying the Sceptre.

The manuscript does not refer to this or to his other territorial arrangements such as the reversal of the decret in favour of Fernihurst. Similarly the views of Angus on church policy are not mentioned in the manuscript, nor the letter and consequent discussion which, in fact, takes up thirty pages in the book, although it does refer to Angus reading James Melville's statement of the current abuses in the church.

The letter referred to in the book (p.412) criticises Angus for lack of action in the controversy between the court and the ministers, with the ministers complaining and the king committing them for their criticism. The sincerity of Angus is not doubted - he is only criticised for lack of action. This letter is used to initiate a discussion between the author and Angus on the question of obedience, with reference being made to Craig's most recent sermon on the subject. Most of what follows is a statement of the author's views where he quotes from Bodinus (Jean Bodin) and Blackwood and ends up by saying Angus should be continuing to take an active part in state and church matters. The reply given by Angus shows him to be sincere and rather longer-sighted than the other: he states that his king's 'good did as much move me .. as any private interest of my own'. He then answers the criticism by pointing out that he is only one and not so close to the king as others, and of his previous supporters only Mar can be relied on. Rather



he has chosen to use the less obtrusive method of avoiding confrontation and working towards gradual change by influencing the king by degrees e.g. getting him to mitigate the confinement of the ministers.

When the office of Chancellor was offered to Angus in the book, (p.429) it states he informed 'the former gentleman and asked his opinion', i.e. the author. In the manuscript it states, 'he told it familiarly to AB one of his own domestic servants', an anonymous reference to the author. The refusal of Angus to take the Chancellorship is explained as his own modesty, since he maintained he did not have the requisite learning and this is recounted in both sources, as is his subsequent acceptance of the lieutenantry of the Borders.

The book (p.432) ends with the verses written as Eulogy about Archibald earl of Angus, while the manuscript gives an account of the arrangements he made before his death. It describes how, when feeling himself to be in decline, he summoned the lairds of Glenbervie (his nearest kin) to Dalkeith and stated his reservations about the younger Glenbervie's Catholicism: 'I exhort you that you will either absolutelie conforme yourself which doubtless I think the best or at least if you cannot at the first soe farre prevaile against your grounded resolucions that you wilbe soe wise soe to governe your exterior actions and profession with that politick and humaine prudence as may give satisfaction to the king and

the state which if you will heare solemnelie promise to performe I will make you to be the most powerful earle that ever hath enjoyed this place'. The young laird replied that he needed time to deliberate and 'tyme to thinke advisedly uppon so weightie a busines' whereupon they parted and never met again. At his death the earl disposed of the earldom of Morton to Lochleven leaving only the earldom of Angus to Glenbervie which was his legal due. According to the manuscript at the time of his death the earl's 'greatest concern was the estate of the Church and of his friends it being the very tyme when the Spanish Navie was at sea the yearre 1588 which he never ceased to regreat and deplore ... he died 1 August 1588'.

Eleven pages dealing with William, Archibald's successor, have been cut out of the manuscript, but a copy of the entire House of Angus section of the Hamilton manuscript contains a copy of these missing pages.<sup>9</sup>

The manuscript, however, continues with a history of his son William who, having attended St Andrews University, 'did attend about two years on his cousin Morton' before going to France where he embraced the Catholic religion. A marriage to Elizabeth Oliphant intended to reform him had the reverse effect and he brought her and 'a great manie of his late alies and familiars to the Catholic faith'. Glenbervie blamed his son for loss of land and inheritance and tried to disown

him but his mother persuaded otherwise. Moreover, the son George who was to replace him in inheritance died before the father. William, according to the manuscript, inherited 'rents burdened with divers debts, continuall thwartes and implacable dislike borne against his religion'. 'Whatsoever comotion did arise either in favor of the Catholics or in prejudice of the authorised religion by the laws of the land, the chief men that were challenged as authors thereof were the earls of Angus, Huntlie and Erroll.' Despite having been warded for his religion the year he came into his inheritance, he was made lieutenant of the North beyond Tay, pacified the North, for which he got no recompense. Then the affair of the Spanish blanks brought him into disrepute. 'Angus, by the secret and earnest dealings of the ambassador Sir William Bowes was committed to Edinburgh'. 'Angus was accused of trafficking with Spain and labouring for the submission of the Gospell professed by his Majestie and the whole estate - lese majestie'. The manuscript maintains there was no evidence as it was a 'privat tie' and even so there was nothing in it against prince or religion plus the fact that Ker's confession had been produced under torture. Yet 'the instance and authoritie of Sir William Bowes, the animositie of the ministers with the hopes of the aspiring courtiers' meant he did not have a chance, hence escape. He then joined Huntly and Erroll who intercepted the king and managed to

get a promise of a fair trial from him, which in fact turned out to be a council of nobility. Again, according to the manuscript, by the Act of Abolition they were found 'innocent but had to conform to religion by 1st February 1594 or retire out of the countrie'. Reference is repeatedly made to the influence of England, a suggestion being made that they should be banished or imprisoned 'until they gave satisfaction to the Queen and her ministers and to oblige his Majesty with greater assurance to the performing thereof, the Queen did grant to his Majestie a great soume of money promising also to pay duellie after that the yearly annuitie that was sent from England divers yeares before to his Majestie in satisfaction for his right to the lands in Yorkshire called Lennox lands'.

Unchastened, Angus and the earls were involved in the episode at Aberdeen whereby James Gordon, a Jesuit uncle to Huntly, a Fleming and two English priests were helped to escape, which angered the ministers who urged the king to pursue the earls. The result was the battle of Glenlivet. Again the ruling was to conform or go beyond the seas. The manuscript does not refer to their apparent apostasy, merely that King James having more than an 'ordinarie affection to the earl of Huntlie' and resolving to restore him to his lands, sent for Robert

Bruce to restore him. Bruce argued against that but on insistence proposed Angus as well. To this the king agreed.

Most importantly, the manuscript states that all this former discourse was found to have been 'sett down in certain noates by the said earl of Angus himself immediat after his escape out of prison, which he dedicat to his son and successor togidder with divers other particular instructions in forme of counsell to remaine as a true record of his innocence if by hazard he should fall thereafter in the hands of his enemies'. Then there follows the description of his lieutenancy of the Borders and dealing with the Maxwell-Johnston feud, which cost him 60,000 merks 'whereof he never received anie part or recompense to this hour'. Again according to the manuscript the ministers started complaining again about the religion of the three earls, Huntly and Erroll being committed to Stirling and Edinburgh and Angus to Glasgow. The latter then asked to be banished to France where he remained until his death in 1611. It is worth noting that his knowledge of genealogy is referred to 'wherein his diligent research did give the onely beginning to this preceding historie'.

From examination and comparison of book and manuscript several facts emerge. Many words, expressions and idioms are identical, as is a large proportion of the

facts relating to the lives of the various earls. Indeed there is a broad seam of close similarity running through both.

But at the same time there are considerable differences: the book ends with the death of Archibald in 1588, the manuscript continues the history down to the death in 1611 of William, father of the first marquis who objected so strongly to Anna Hume's publication. Once wonders why this should be since Archibald died at least thirty years before the time Hume was writing. The suggestion that Archibald was the last of the direct line is an inadequate explanation as, throughout the history, there are examples of the title going to collateral branches. Furthermore, the manuscript ends with a conclusion pointing out the continuity of the line from Douglas to Angus by stating:

that George 2 being contemporary with the importunate James, the last of the earls of Douglas, and syding with the King (whose cousin/germain he was) in the others overthrow, yet being of the same stem and name and obtaining a large portion of the earle of Douglas his landes togidder with the offices and martiall imployments belonging to that house and especially the title and lordship of Douglas, he took a wise and politicke course to uphold and bear out the dignitie and grandeur of the former house of Douglas which his worthie successors did likewise imitate and follow out even to those our dayes'.

This shows a logical conclusion to the history which one would expect from a scholar of Hume's calibre. By stopping in 1588 the books omits the Glenbervie succession and with it the subsequent religious



difference. In fact the book even omits any mention of the arrangements Archibald made before he died, taking cognisance of the religious stance of his successors.

Also noteworthy is the difference in the selection of material in the two sources. The manuscript includes much more detail in many instances of events that are recounted in the book and supports with documentary evidence where possible in the form of charters and bonds most of the history contained therein. One of the most obvious differences occurs in the early history of the house of Angus which is presented as fully as possible in the manuscript but appears in a very condensed form in the book, and without reference to documents or the Douglas charter chest. The other great difference is in the history of Archibald the ninth: in the book there is the inclusion of a letter and subsequent lengthy discussion which has no counterpart in the manuscript. The main burden of the discussion is a lengthy statement of the author's views on the question of obedience and rebellion. This has the effect of distorting the family history and changing its aspect radically, presenting it as a vehicle for expression of political attitudes along Calvinistic lines. It is no wonder that the marquis and his son objected to this. Also in the book there is much greater reference to the state of the church particularly from 1580 to the end of the book, as well as additional details concerning the Protestant ministers.

Religion is seen to be a paramount issue in the book, whereas it does not obtrude in the manuscript. The manuscript is in fact a chronological family history, being what one would expect from the title, and emphasising the role of the house of Angus in the history of Scotland.

When the marquis complained that Anna Hume's publication was not the 'richt trew coppie',<sup>10</sup> he was most likely complaining about the inclusion of the religious and political material which has no place in the manuscript, together with the condensation of much of the early history and omission of the later family history.

That the book had been given a distinct Protestant religious slant and that the later Catholic members of the family had not been mentioned would have certainly displeased the marquis and his son, but not enough to have caused them to arrest publication. Rather one must look to the correspondence with Drummond to find an explanation for that action. 'This book by these tymes will be much made of; and above the whole the last part of it where are discourses which authorise rebellion and the forcing of consciences and putting the sword in the people's hand'.<sup>11</sup> This is particularly relevant in the Civil War setting in which the book was published, but the significant statement is the one which follows: 'In a little more tyme if our Princes shall reobtaine their authoritie it may be challenged'. Hence the importance

of the conclusion in the manuscript pointing out the fact that Angus sided with the king against his cousin who was rebelling. Again Drummond comments on the 'extremne puritanical' elements of the book which would be at odds with a king whose religious proclivities were distinctly High Church and a family whose leaders had been Catholic for the last fifty years.

Who actually wrote the manuscript is difficult to say since five different hands are in evidence but equally who wrote the book is not clear either. David Hume's name appears on both. They purport to be the same but are in fact quite different. Of only one thing is there any certainty: both book and manuscript have a common ancestor.

This leads one to consider who in fact altered and added material to the original to produce the book. There is the suggestion that Sir George Douglas of Mordington, Hume's literary executor, may have been responsible but this is unlikely. As a member of the royal household and relative of Angus, he is hardly likely to have made such a political vehicle out of the manuscript. Nor was he known to have strong Protestant sympathies. Again Anna Hume states that what she published was as she had found it among her father's papers, unaltered by her in any way. So that eliminates her. In fact the most likely candidate would appear to have been David Hume's son James, who did have strong

Protestant sympathies, who doubtless had access to his father's papers and who published and edited many of his father's poems along with his own.<sup>12</sup>

As for the manuscript, how much of it is as David Hume wrote, is impossible to say with any degree of certainty. Nor is it possible to identify the various hands that penned the manuscript, or what, if any alterations were made to what they were copying, since the original is not extant. Suffice it to say that regardless of all these uncertainties, the manuscript is an interesting and valuable document in its own right, providing not only a direct link with the seventeenth century but also giving quotations from and references to documents that are no longer extant and of whose existence in some cases there is no other evidence.

## NOTES

## CHAPTER THREE

1. David Hume, The History of the House of Douglas and Angus (Evan Tyler, 1644). The individual page references are superscribed in the text.
2. SRO TD 87/86. As with the previous chapter it is useless to paginate as many numbers are repeated.
3. A A M Duncan, Scotland: the Making of the Kingdom (Edinburgh, 1975), pp. 407-8: in relation to knights and barons their special relationship with a great magnate arose from the fact that he was a great magnate and that their holdings lay within the geographical range of his influence.
4. See Appendix A.
5. Davidis Humii de familia Humia Wedderburnensi liber, ed. John Miller MD for the Abbotsford Club (Edinburgh, 1839).
6. Ibid.
7. Father of the author.
8. Brother of the author.
9. See Appendix B.
10. Fraser, Douglas Book , p.252.
11. Ibid., p.254.
12. David Hume, Jacoboea (Paris, 1639).

## CHAPTER FOUR

HUME OF GODSCROFT AS HISTORIOGRAPHER

When assessing Hume<sup>1</sup> as a historian we have the evidence of the printed History of the House of Douglas and Angus and the manuscript as compared above. But there is no doubt that there we have problems: how much is Godscroft's own work, how much has been added or removed is impossible to say. There is the added problem that he was writing for a patron who had not only provided rough notes but who had commissioned the history at royal request, 'First delineaments were drawn by my Lord your Honours father ... at the express command of his king our much honoured late sovereign'. Furthermore in his address to Charles he is at pains to mention:-

Let this not be the least of your renowne  
that from the Douglas you descended downe

And so one must remember that the History was not just for the earl of Angus but was also intended for royal eyes. Bounded by these constraints, it is difficult to arrive at the real Hume of Godscroft.

He refers to the History in his Address to the Reader 'as an obliged dutie as depending from others to whome my labours and my life doe owe all lawfull obedience' and admits to partiality and labouring to please, regretting philosophically that he wished he could please everybody but aware that 'he who undertakes to write makes himself a mark of censure for men to level at'. He maintains



impartiality is an impossibility for any writer: 'Neither do I think that ever any man did set pen to paper without some particular relation of kindred, country and such like'. But 'content to acknowledge my interest ... the truth be stuck unto'. This truth he pursued by enduring 'some many painfull Houres in searching out the records of former adges the infallible proofes of ancient monuments and such traditions onelie as were confirmed by faithfull testimonie of approved authors', concluding 'the offer I do make thee is veritie not words' and as in best practice a bibliography is provided along with marginal source references. There are repeated references to documents, indentures and bonds, some of which are quoted verbatim, others described as 'still extant to this day with seal attached'.

Even the authority of the source is commented on, for example, 'the manuscript of Sir Richard Maitland of Lethintoune which he carefully collected out of ancient records. The manuscript was given to the earl of Mortoune Regent of the kingdome of Scotland and is extant to this day'. Again we are made aware when he does not agree with his source: 'which being the judgement of one of the most judicious writers I will not contest but leave it in the middle and soberlie crave that men may weigh it and see if there be any necessitie to make us think it so'. He also points out that he could just have reiterated what was already stated in acknowledged

histories but looks for corroboration and where sources conflict he gives the various versions, for instance concerning Bruce's fourth expedition into England:

some doe wryte that king Robert was present in person others that he gave the governement of the affaire to Sir James Douglas and Sir Thomas Randolph or thirdlie that Sir Thomas Randolph earl of Murray was general lieutenant of the armie and that the lord Douglas and the Great Steward of Scotland were sente for accompanying him.

There is even an element of exasperation at lack of information:

it is a matter worthie of regreat to consider the negligence of our wrytters in these times of desolation whoe in this as in many other the like occasions belonging to the essence and perfection of a Historie doe not remember the names of those whoe were the Authors and complices in soe remarkable a conspiratio

- this is said in relation to the revolt against Bruce for which Abernethy was executed and his title transferred to the Douglasses. He criticises 'our writers' for 'the great obscuring of theise things that had need of farre more light in the true perfection of an Historie'. This is also part of what he sees as 'the need to know what hath beene every man's parte what were the occasions moving them and how duetifullie or undutifullie done'. He knows what historiography should involve, he has definite criteria but at the same time when he states: 'I know not if I should so revere any man's personne as to believe it absolutely and with implicit faith because he hath said it', it is a high minded statement of the importance of checking and

verification but it is said in relation to the activities of William eighth earl whose high-handed behaviour and extent of power and wealth is generally seen to have been considered a threat to the king. And so a statement of impeccable historical standards can be the guise for special pleading. And so he defends his patron. As David Allan states, 'It was precisely because of an essentially humanist understanding which they had of their own function of scholars that the parallel requirements of factual accuracy and moral or political commitment had to co-exist in the rhetoric of history widely voiced by early modern Scottish writers'.<sup>2</sup>

This he does on several occasions, interposing his judgement of men's actions which he considers 'the life of History and without which it were little better than an old wives tale'. Behaviour is excused by means of explanation, for example when Angus supported the king against Douglas in 1455 this is excused by stating he was more closely related to the king than to Douglas. Again when the sixth earl virtually created his own court in opposition to Crichton and Livingston this is explained in terms of a defence of the old families at the expense of the new: 'they are the truest servants and most able to do (their princes) good service'. Hume's attitude to the Douglasses is summed up by the concluding statement: 'the errors and faults whatsoever they fell

into they were drawn unto them by the craft and callumnies at court', which is as broad-based an apologia as one could ever hope to find.

A similar attitude is adopted towards the monarch even when there would appear to be a conflict of loyalties on the part of the author. The Black Dinner and the murder of the eighth earl are the most obvious instances. In the former Crichton and Livingston are blamed, in the latter Patrick Gray. Hume volunteers a defence of James I: some writers 'layeing some aspersion uppon that king of hard usage or at least intention thereof to divers of the chief nobilitie that were in his tyme: but I am content to vindicat a prince soe well accomplished as hee was, from such fowle aspersions as also all princes from such a wrong impression and ill grounded oppinion'. Such statements were obviously intended for the royal reader but also indicate a desire for balance, presenting not just the author's view but also the alternative, providing the opposition view if only to demolish it.

The aim of 'veritie' or factual accuracy can explain the omission of what is not obvious from documentary sources and why no inference is made. A case in point is James the Gross, seventh earl of Douglas. Present scholarship<sup>3</sup> suggests that he was colluding with Crichton and Livingston over the murder of his great nephews, although there is no absolute proof. One can only assume it is this absence of evidence together with the

fact it is not implied by other historians that makes Hume give such a simplistic treatment of the seventh earl, indicating that his corpulence led to inactivity. Certainly this is one of the most confusing parts of the book because not only is James described as uncle instead of great uncle but the Maid of Galloway, sister of the murdered Douglasses, is called Beatrix, which is the name of James's wife. It should be noted, however, that Buchanan similarly called the Maid Beatrix. But usually so careful to trace connections and relationships, Hume also overlooks the way James the Gross reunited the Douglas patrimony, and extended his influence by the marriage of his son William to the Maid of Galloway. By so doing he gained for the Douglasses the support of her stepfather Sir James Hamilton and Sir Alexander Livingston of Callendar his grandfather; his son, Archibald, was married to the daughter of the earl of Moray, and although she was a younger daughter he outmanoeuvred the rightful claimant and gained the earldom for his son. By taking advantage of the Schism he also obtained for his son James the bishopric of Aberdeen. Perhaps the shortness of the period of tenure of the earldom misled Hume, along with the fact that the marriage of the Fair Maid took place after the death of James, although he had set in motion the plea for papal dispensation. Even so, is the confusion an attempt to obfuscate a damning episode in the illustrious family's

history or are the errors genuine? We can never know, but since 'the truth must be stuck to' is the professed intention, we must assume the latter.

A further example of, in this case, erroneous special pleading concerns the murder of the duke of Rothesay in 1402. There is no hint of Douglas involvement although many historians agree that most likely Albany and Douglas planned this together. In fact Hume goes to the other extreme of suggesting that Douglas would have helped him if he could but was away fighting and was captured at Homildon. However, Rothesay was imprisoned in January and died in March, Homildon was not until September 1402. Moreover, the relationship between Albany and Douglas is evident from examination of the Registrum Magni Sigilli when Albany, issuing charters in his own name for the first time, adds the seal of Douglas to give greater weight, referring to James Douglas as that great and powerful magnate brother of the earl Archibald who is repeatedly referred to as 'our beloved kinsman'.<sup>4</sup>

All in all, one is aware in the History of Douglas and Angus of special pleading and omissions as well as the occasional factual error.<sup>5</sup> It is interesting, however, to use the same criteria when examining his other lesser known history, The History of the Family of Humes of Wedderburn, written in 1611 but not published until 1839 by the Abbotsford Club. Unfortunately the only manuscript copy extant is not that of the author but a



copy on the back of which it is stated: 'This was written and doubled by John Law writer in Edinburgh and the marginall notes upon it wer written by the hand of the deceast Mr William Hog advocat father to the deceast Lord Harcarse and given by the said John Law to the Laird of Wedderburn younger'. This copy is in Register House along with a nineteenth-century translation of what can be seen as the story-line,<sup>6</sup> which omits the philosophical passages and author's reflections as well as some of the details. Even so, there are mistranslations, for example 'latrunculus' is translated as tennis rather than chess and there is evidence of clerical errors in the manuscript copy: 'pultes' in place of 'poltes' which, although not detracting from the narrative, spoils the classical allusion. The printed version attempts to remedy the solecisms where they are obvious and so it is to this version that reference is made in the ensuing pages and which is translated in the appendix to this chapter.

With this history there was no patron, no commission, no royal reader whose displeasure would be incurred. The book was meant for family consumption and was intended to inform and instruct the author's nephew who would be the next laird. He explains in the Preface: 'from time to time it has irked me when scanning the history of our own country to find so little mention of our own people: scarcely one or two and they with merely

casual mention and yet their exploits were not so slight' and so he was rectifying an obvious omission. At the same time he was giving his nephew cause for pride in his ancestry and, most important, a sense of place, after the melting pot of 1603 when the Scottish nobility and chiefs who did not go south with James were in danger of being classed as second-rate citizens. After all their near neighbours and erstwhile enemy Kerr was now a Duke, with an English title. But at the most obvious level the History was a moral tale when he instructs his nephew about his ancestors: 'their ability, their courage is worthy of imitation as is the example of their moral excellence and where they have lapsed their errors are an example to be avoided'. However, he does admit to partiality stating that he is merely giving an outline: 'perhaps a pen more equal to the task or at least one who can do it with more impartiality will finish the task' and proof of this partiality is the apologia at the end of the introduction. 'When one looks more carefully at the mistakes one realises the errors were not so much of the persons themselves as of the age they lived in. It was an age of warriors not philosophers, less studious of what was right and just than of honour and glory an attitude which is still too prevalent'. This presumably is the excuse for unmitigated thuggery and lawlessness evident among so many of his ancestors and it is to his credit that he does nothing to conceal or camouflage a

way of life based on force. But it also shows a keen sense of history on the part of the writer, and considerable analytical powers.

The Wedderburn History is presented in similar fashion to The History of the House of Douglas and Angus. After a dedication to the earl of Hume and the author's brother George, head of the Humes of Wedderburn, there is an Introduction addressed to his nephew David. The Humes of Wedderburn are then presented in chronological order, starting with first reference to the name and the first chief David at the beginning of the fifteenth century and concluding with the author's brother George. Each is identified by christian name and number in the way royal families are identified. In all there are five Davids and three Georges, a section being devoted to each in the manner of the Douglas history, and at the end of each section there is a verse about the individual by way of elegy. Obviously there is no verse for George since he was still alive at the time of writing.<sup>7</sup> But the great difference between the two histories is that whereas the Douglas history is written in English, that of the Humes of Wedderburn is written in Latin.

Although there is no bibliography, it is clear that Hume consulted other historians: Lesley, Holinshed and Buchanan are quoted, but more often he refers to historians as a group, 'our historians' (p.14), 'as the historians say' (p.23), 'authors relate' (p.33), 'if what

historians say is true' (p.36) and 'there are those who write' (p.36). This gives the impression of a body of material with which he was completely au fait. There is no doubt that he did not intend his history to be a source book or means to further research by his nephew. Rather it is as if he is the purveyor of the sum of his own and other writers' knowledge to date. This does not mean to say that he always agrees with 'our historians'. But, as often in the Douglas history, he is careful to give the received opinion and then adds his own opinion and leaves the reader to decide. An instance is the restoration of the earl George to his estates: 'our writers say these facts happened at the same time as the killing of de la Bastie. I rather think they happened at the same time as the Blackadder killing' (p.34). He also points out that 'historians claim' that David the fourth came to Edinburgh with 800 men in 1520 and forced the town gates but the battle was over by then. There is also the careful relation of varying accounts. 'There are various stories' concerning the meeting of the earl of Hume and Albany at Dumbarton: 'some say' (p.23) he was disappointed in what he saw, 'others say' (p.23) 'Hume had too great a retinue'. And he gives the different opinions as to why Albany turned against the earl. But where he is uncertain or does not know that too is stated: when the dispute arose between David the first and his nephew Alexander, Godscroft states, 'what right

or law he invoked I do not know' (p.8). Similarly concerning the suspicions said to be harboured by Albany he states 'I know not what they were or where they came from as there is no evidence' (p.23). With reference to the date of de la Bastie's murder in relation to that of the earl and his brother, he suggests writer's or printer's errors but claims he has laboured in vain over this and similar matters (p.33). With reference to the claim by some historians that the benefice of Coldingham was given by Pope and Regent to Patrick the cousin of the murdered prior Blackadder, his view is 'how true this is I do not know' (p.36). Similarly, regarding the first knighthood awarded to his ancestors, he remarks of David the first 'but for what reason he acquired that honour which is usually bestowed in battle I have not discovered' (p.8). And so one is left with the impression of diligent and painstaking research and the frustrations and difficulties which beset the researcher.

Interestingly from our point of view he makes reference to oral tradition which gives immediacy and apparent authenticity to the narrative. In relation to the killing of de la Bastie, he states it was exactly as he has described it, 'having heard from those who were present at the action' (p.33). 'A fact which people remember' (p.18) is how he describes some of David the third's actions. Of the younger brother of the murdered earl of Hume, he states: 'to this day he is referred to



as David the Innocent' (p.28) as further proof of his non-involvement. Also concerning George the first who was said to have laid low the English at Mellerstain, he claims 'this has been handed down by our ancestors and is celebrated both in oral tradition and folk song'. And in relation to the acquisition of the lands of Thurston he includes his own recollection: '...I remember hearing as a boy that our ancestors had held the estate of Thurston long before that of Wedderburn' (p.6). It is difficult, of course, to evaluate oral tradition but often there is some substance behind it: it was oral tradition that led to Schliemann's discovery of the location of Troy.

As the author himself states, so much of the History is based on family documents and their importance is emphasised in the Dedication to his brother: 'In your control are the memorials and writings of history ... material must be gathered and heaped up for the workmen'. He also refers to 'obscure memorials of letters or testimonials', 'private matters of the house of Wedderburn' and 'memorials which are still extant'. One finds repeated reference to documents in the text: the charter from James II to David the first (p.7) in 1450; the arbitration (p.8) of 12 October 1441; a retour (p.10) of 1494; the Kimmerghame records (p.11) of 1461; the marriage bond with Alice (p.20) sister of Archibald



Douglas 'as can be seen in the papers drawn up and autographed by them'. Godscroft is very conscious of the value of primary sources.

It should be remembered, however, that half the History occurs within reach of the author's own life, either involving his own personal experience and memory or that of his father and brother and so much of what is recounted would have had the backing of corroboration. When he dedicated the book to his brother, Godscroft must have been aware that he was the one most able to criticise and therefore was most likely to have been consulted. In fact it is Godscroft's closeness to his subject that is one of the attractions of the History. Unfortunately the History stops before the author's involvement in the Ruthven Raid and his subsequent flight to England along with Angus. But Godscroft was not writing a political history or a general history of the period. His main concern was family involvement in significant events in Scottish history and in particular famous battles, illustrating the heroic qualities of his ancestors and their patriotism. Hence there is a catalogue of Hume involvement from Vermeuil to Carberry. This is in accordance with what he professed in the Introduction, to remedy the deficiency occasioned by 'scanning the history of our country' and finding 'so little mention of our own people'. However the unsettled atmosphere at court after the return of Esmé

Stewart provides the background to much of George the third, his brother's activities. Largely through his friendship with and relationship to Angus he became involved in the clash of mighty opposites, viz. Morton and the Stewarts. As Wedderburn aligned with Angus and Morton, so his local rival Manderston aligned with Arran. According to Godscroft it was on Manderston's prompting that Arran devised plans against his brother's life. But then he had been involved along with Angus in an attempt to rescue Morton from prison (p.73). Just how fraught the situation was can be deduced from the statement that the Wedderburn messenger was interrogated and the correspondence between the author and Gowrie and Seton had to be concealed in the messenger's sock (p.74). Even allowing for some exaggeration one gets a definite feeling of the instability of the time and the danger of belonging to the wrong faction. It is at that point in the History that the author becomes personally involved and refers to himself as David brother of Wedderburn and recounts his own involvement in the third person, making a clear dichotomy between his role as author expressing opinions and philosophising about events and that of participant. Not surprisingly his own role assumes heroic proportions: he it was who advised his brother how to outwit Arran and Manderston, who went to court to get his brother released from custody and who was responsible for managing the estate in his brother's absence, keeping

potential predators at bay. He portrays himself as the devoted and totally loyal younger brother, returning from his study tour at the first indication that his brother needed him, unlike his companion who, he tells us, wanted to wait for a second letter. Moreover he, with 'moderation lest his advantage should be a hindrance to family harmony', voluntarily gave up his inheritance (p.64); and even gave up his betrothed to his brother, thinking it unfair to 'oppose both his brother's love and the maiden's advantage' (p.70).

Regarding the accuracy of the History, the fact remains that most of it is based on documentary evidence but it is the reasoning or explanation that is at times partial. There is no doubt that the murder of de la Bastie is the high point of the History, a fact that the name of Hume would be linked to and would be common knowledge. The explanation that it was not premeditated, together with the vilification of Albany whose vice-regent he was, does suggest special pleading. Certainly pride was taken in the act as de la Bastie's hair was kept at Wedderburn castle until the early nineteenth century and the field where the incident happened has been identified as Swallowdean, exactly where Hume described it.<sup>8</sup> However, the portrayal of Albany as the ruthless murderer of innocent young men, Lord Hume and his brother, is far from the truth. As Godscroft states, the earl had been greatly in favour of the invitation to

Albany to accept the governorship but was most likely offended that Albany did not show gratitude, together with the fact which Godscroft relates that Albany was given the title earl of March which had been the possession of the Humes. But Godscroft's description of Albany as an arrogant (p.24 et seq) oathbreaker imposing foreign rule on Scotland and a danger to the young king and his brother is patently untrue. Considering the record of the Humes it should be remembered that under James III Alexander Hume had played both ends against the middle. First he supported Albany and was rewarded with land in Lothian, March and Berwick; then he supported James against his brother and was further rewarded with Chirnside, only to join the opposition headed by the future James IV and the earl of Argyll, for which Alexander was rewarded with the post of Chamberlain for life, keeper of Stirling castle, guardian of young John, the king's brother, with revenues from Mar and the Garioch and wardenship of the East Marches.<sup>9</sup>

Even if Albany did not know their recent history there was enough evidence to show they were incessant troublemakers and, as Godscroft admits, far excelled the rest of the nobility in power. Repeated rebellion and conspiracy to take the young king away from Albany could only be ended by their removal. They were pardoned, hence the accusation that Albany was an oathbreaker, only to repeat the offence, and Albany showed considerable

skill in maintaining his position against a coalition of Highland chiefs, Arran and the Humes, encouraged by Henry VIII who was only too ready to claim overlordship of Scotland and who repeatedly wrote to the Scottish parliament asking for Albany's removal, indeed threatening war if Albany was not expelled.<sup>10</sup>

Far from imposing foreign rule, Albany kept to a national and independent line in Scotland and one of his first acts was a letter to Leo X urging the Pope to respect the crown's privileges.<sup>11</sup> He went on to refuse to accept the Pope's authority over the appointment to the archbishopric of St Andrews, selecting instead of the papal choice Andrew Forman, whose family were clients of the Humes, but taking care to divest him of Moray, Aberdeen, Dryburgh and Kilwinning<sup>12</sup> which were then used to placate and compensate the Hepburn faction.

Similarly with regard to the young king and his brother, far from being a threat to them as is implied in the History, Albany did much to protect their interests and even refused to send the young prince to France although requested to do so by his own king, Francis. Faced with two powerful and aggressive neighbours, France and England, whose rulers as young Renaissance princes were out to make names for themselves as conquerors and empire-builders, Albany not only maintained a difficult independent position but endeavoured to make sure that Scotland was considered on their level and not as a

potential dependant territory. It was to this end that he extended the Concordat of Bologna to Scotland whereby the Scottish crown obtained the right to have a say in the appointment of Scottish prelates and then very significantly he got the Pope to take Scotland and, more importantly, the young king under his protection. It must be remembered that the young king's mother was the sister of Henry VIII and as such for most of the time gave England an unfair advantage in the struggle for control of Scotland. But at this stage Henry was anxious to show his orthodoxy and was engaged in writing his Assertio Septem Sacramentorum contra Martinum Lutherum exalting papal authority to such an extent that the title Fidei Defensor would be awarded to him in gratitude by the Pope, and so Albany's move was extremely adroit. Even though he was out of Scotland 1517-20, Albany sought positively the welfare of Scotland. This, however, is described as being able to govern and transact everything at the nod from France, which Godscroft interprets as loss of liberty.

Even in the field of commerce Albany did much to further Scottish interests: he warned that the Hansa in Hamburg intended making trouble for Scots, and wrote to Christian of Denmark to settle matters;<sup>13</sup> he obtained trading concessions for Scottish merchants in France as a small compensation for their military assistance at Flodden and recognition of the part the Scottish Archers



played in France. Similarly the settlement of the Scottish Staple at Middelburg in Walcheren was mainly due to his efforts.<sup>14</sup> The reluctance of the Scots to go to war against the English in 1523, which Godscroft sees as antagonism to Albany, who was urging this course and who was being undermined by the Angus faction, can be explained by unwillingness to risk a repeat of Flodden, to lose yet again the cream of the country, and most recent research suggests the French expeditionary force arrived in mid-October, too late for the campaigning season.<sup>15</sup> But far from being unpopular Albany's rule was appreciated to such an extent that he was seen as more effective at maintaining law and order than the native nobility who were the cause of repeated upheaval and self-seeking aggrandisement.<sup>16</sup>

The reference to de la Bastie's head being taken to Hume Castle is unlikely since the castle was in the possession of Albany at the time. Much more likely is Wedderburn Castle, also in view of the fact that his hair was kept there.

David Hume, the younger brother of the two who were executed, was by no means the Innocent as alleged by Godscroft: he was summoned along with his brothers, accused of treason and then pardoned along with them.<sup>17</sup> And when his brothers were executed he too was summoned but fled from Coldingham to England only to return to occupy Coldingham by force. It is significant that in

contemporary sources Hepburn is not connected with his killing,<sup>18</sup> although Godscroft makes him the blackhearted villain who broke every social bond of friendship and kinship by doing so. However those Godscroft calls his accomplices are listed and Ninian Chirnside was under church censure for the murder and summoned to pay compensation three years later.<sup>19</sup> Even the explanation of this alleged behaviour on the part of Hepburn does not bear scrutiny. Said by Godscroft to have borne a grudge because of the Forman appointment to the archbishopric of St Andrews and to have been the Iago to Albany's Othello, Hepburn was in fact given very substantial revenues and privileges and two of his kin were made bishops, which rather detracts from the credibility of the alleged motive.<sup>20</sup>

And then there was the murder of Robert Blackadder, prior of Coldingham, which Godscroft states was also unpremeditated: 'when by chance they clashed during a hunt' (p.35). But he also mentions that Blackadder 'openly hostile, opposed himself to everything Wedderburn did'. And David the fourth was not the sort of person to brook any opposition, e.g. when his brother-in-law Edrington (p.34) did not give up his castle to him he took it by force. And of course there was the longstanding enmity which was 'stubbornly maintained on both sides', originating at the battle of Kella according to Godscroft, but more likely occasioned by the marriage

of David the fourth to the widow of Robert Blackadder of that ilk, mistakenly called William by the author. That the marriage was 'greedily' sought (p.20) by Angus as being to his great advantage does seem to be an exaggeration, as Jenny Wormald has shown the marriage contract was the weakest form of kin,<sup>21</sup> and especially when David proceeded to marry his brothers John and Patrick to his new stepdaughters who were the sole heiresses. This episode certainly entered the folklore of the area with stories of the imprisonment of the widow and daughters who were considerably under age, and forced marriage.<sup>22</sup> David was even alleged to have murdered the husband in order to marry his widow. The confusion has most likely arisen through wrongly identifying the murder victim of the same name, together with the Hume reputation for violence. It is interesting to note, however, that Hume makes no mention of the killing of Patrick Blackadder in 1525<sup>23</sup> by the Wedderburns, although he does refer to their involvement in his exclusion from Coldingham (p.36) in favour of William Douglas.

Also of interest in connection with the murder of Robert Blackadder and de la Bastie is the question of English participation. No mention is made of this in the History yet there is repeated reference to the fact in the letters of James V.<sup>24</sup> It could of course be a diplomatic fabrication for French consumption, but in view of the close relationship between Lord Dacre, the

English warden and the Humes - George the brother of the murdered earl sought asylum with him, George's niece was sent to him to be educated and when David the earl's brother fled from Coldingham that is where he was sought - participation was most likely. But such an admission would obviously detract from the nationalistic tone of the History.

But the strength of this History does not lie in its accuracy or lack of it. The most important factor is that it is a social history describing life in the Borders over a period of two hundred years, with the emphasis being on the period within the author's own lifespan. But more than that there is a clear indication of the values of the time as illustrated by Godscroft. Thus it is not the facts and statement themselves but the deductions that may be made from them.

Throughout the History the importance of 'clientes' is evident - 'clientes' being that amorphous collection of kin and dependants who owed their position to mutual dependence, protection and loyalty. In the course of his account of David the fourth, Godscroft explains the importance of the special relationship between lord and dependant: 'all those who were kinsfolk by blood or friendship or those who by whatever means had become dependants he never deserted'. Before the battle of Kella Patrick Hume, out to avenge his brother's murder by the English, saw evidence of the English arrival at

Lampton. He 'returned to his people' (p.15), 'joined up with his nephew David who was already armed and welcomed his friends and dependants who were rushing to him from all sides' (p.15). It was considered the special care of noblemen that they should take up the causes of their friends and dependants as their own; that they should maintain and sustain them as their own and to such an extent they bound their friends to them with those devices so that these friends had regard for them alone and were prepared to offer them (p.21) 'property life, indeed everything'. And this argument was used by David in his exchange with de la Bastie over the execution of Cockburn of Lampton's will. The will had excluded Cockburn's brother William (David's brother-in-law). David had taken up his brother-in-law's cause and with his brothers laid siege to Lampton. When de la Bastie suggested recourse to law, not violence, David replied it was none of de la Bastie's business since William was not his dependant. Whether or not this dialogue took place is not important although Godscroft maintains he had heard about it from those who were present at the action. What is important is the prevailing sentiment about the relationship between a lord and his dependants and incidentally the effect of that relationship upon the maintenance of law and order. As Jenny Wormald has shown, Scottish society and politics were regularly dominated or bedevilled by considerations of kin even



more than rank or status. But Hume was writing after the demise of the bonds of manrent and what he is doing is harking back to the previous ethos, and to some extent regretting its passing.

It was also a matter of how many men one could bring to battle - obviously a matter of importance. This point is illustrated when Godcroft's father took the field at Carberry, 'surrounded (p.44) by a great band of retainers and companions', the main body of the Queen's support according to Godscroft - a source of jealousy (p.45) for Bothwell and worthy of comment by Morton as a force to be reckoned with. What he did with such a force could determine the outcome. When David subsequently changed sides he sent his retainers and dependants under the leadership of his uncle (p.45) to fight for the king.

When George, the author's brother, became laird, his main concern was to establish his own and the family's reputation which had suffered at the hands of his stepmother. This was accomplished by the rest of the family giving over to him their portions and so he was able to surround himself with quite a large retinue and maintained a troop (p.64) of about eighteen horsemen, each of whom had two horses and a foot attendant. The retinue in itself was obviously by then a matter of prestige and social standing. A practical illustration is also provided of how this was augmented: Kimmerhame's



inhabitants, well accustomed to bearing arms and possessing very fine horses, were brought under his clientage and thus 'ready to serve him at a moments notice' (p.64), providing him with thirty 'fierce and warlike horsemen'. But more significant is the practical detail of how he increased the number of his vassals with the people of Girnielaw: he leased to the inhabitants the teinds at almost the same price as he had paid for them. This earned their goodwill and so he found them 'most ready for every service'. Here one is given an insight into the mechanics of building up a fighting force, and extending clientage.

One gets a distinct impression of a vertical social structure with a recognised pecking order and it was when this order was upset or altered either by civil war, feud or adversity that tensions rose. Alexander, Lord Hume had been somewhat alienated by 'the slanders of enemies who suggested that the house of Wedderburn was acting as if the equal of his own'. Although it was pointed out to him that the Wedderburns had actually restored their chief, after the execution of the Chamberlain and his brother, that sort of comment was hardly likely to be reassuring and it is no wonder Alexander tended to ally with Manderston, a cadet branch of the Wedderburn family, against Wedderburn. Similarly when Manderston and others took advantage of their chief Lord Hume's forfeiture after the civil war and took possession of his

lands it is stated that they increased their possessions and power to such an extent that they rivalled or even surpassed the author's father, Sir David Hume of Wedderburn. A noteworthy point is the statement by Godscroft that although Manderston, escorted by numerous servants and retainers, with his power and ostentation impressed people in other regions, in the Merse this was not so: 'David's power was founded on an ancient family and the faithfulness of his retainers and with this he could not be equalled'. This adds substance to the concept that kindred was sustained both by the idea of its necessity and by association with a locality and that geographical unity and neighbourhood were far more relevant than blood.<sup>25</sup>

And of course the natural concomitant of such power structures was the feud. The feud, largely inherited and under the direction and control of the men who could count on the support of their 'clientes' plays a significant part in the history of the Wedderburn family in a way that was by no means atypical of the period throughout Europe. The feud between Wedderburn and Blackadder as related by Godscroft is a classic example. Blackadder, it is stated, having a grudge against Nisbet who was a Wedderburn supporter, did not take part in the battle of Kella for this reason, and even sheltered the fleeing English. 'They say Blackadder was crammed with such a multitude of English fugitives that the houses and

yards (p.16) could not contain them'. This was seen by Wedderburn as an insult and so 'great enmity blazed forth among the neighbouring families and was stubbornly maintained on both sides with one cause of hatred arising from another that it finally caused the destruction of the family (p.16) of Blackadder in that area', provocation leading to retaliation on both sides. The son of the slighted Wedderburn, David the fourth, married Robert Blackadder's widow and then proceeded to marry her daughters, who were the sole heirs, to his brothers John and Robert. Not surprisingly others of the Blackadder kindred resented this and Robert Blackadder, prior of Coldingham, 'in accordance with the enmity both ancient and recent concerning the patrimony of Blackadder opposed himself to everything David did'. We are told they clashed 'by chance', during a hunt and fought until Blackadder and his retinue were killed. However, Godscroft does not mention the killing of Patrick Blackadder by the Wedderburns. Presumably that is covered by the statement about their extinction in the area. Similarly the relationship with the Hepburns was that of feud. According to Godscroft this was caused by Hepburn's lack of success in acquiring the Bishopric of St Andrews for which he blamed the Humes, since as it is described in the History the successful candidate Forman's family were dependants of the Humes and Alexander the chief was bound to him 'by a recent act of

kindness (p.25) whereby David received the priory of Coldingham'. Accordingly Hepburn was said to be instrumental in the execution of Alexander and his brother as well as the murder of the said David, recipient of the favour. And of course an integral part of feud was vengeance. When Hepburn was an old man, many years after his alleged involvement in the killing of the Hume brothers, and obviously suffering from spondilitis, John Hume of Blackadder, meeting him by chance, was advised by a zealous retainer that this was an ideal opportunity for vengeance. His response was that there was greater satisfaction to be derived from letting him live 'that his life (p.29) which no man envies him be more bitter than any kind of death'. As Keith Brown states, the primary duty of the kinsman was vengeance but more than that it was an integral part of the code of honour.<sup>26</sup> Just as vengeance was a main theme of the contemporary play 'Hamlet' and exaction of vengeance was accepted as appropriate heroic behaviour, so Godscroft considered it a worthy precept to be taught to his nephew by example. The instances quoted are numerous. When George the first was murdered by the English his brother Patrick, who spent most of his time at court, left the court to seek 'an opportunity for vengeance' (p.16), and combined with his nephew David for this purpose. The result was the battle of Kella. David, we are told, did not cease from avenging his

father's death until the whole family 'of him who was said to be the perpetrator of that slaughter was either put to the sword or forced into exile so that none of that name was found within fifty miles of the Border'. Again it is stated with reference to the execution of Alexander the Chamberlain and his brother that since David the fourth of Wedderburn 'was nearest by natural ties of blood place and position he (p.29) was obliged to become involved' and the whole episode of the murder of de la Bastie is explained as vengeance. Whether this was the case or not is of secondary importance; the main factor is that vengeance is seen to be a justification and is morally acceptable.

But it is interesting to note that the 'clientes' structure was by no means rigid and immutable. Referring to them, Godscroft states: 'In times of unrest they don't have to be led, they neither ask permission nor are they obedient to or compliant with their chiefs since they know themselves who needs support. And their chiefs do not punish them'. An example is given in the confrontation with de la Bastie: 'some openly changed sides, others melted away from him'. This does much to explain the criticisms levied at the Border chiefs and the lawlessness of their followers referred to in both Histories. And no doubt it was in part occasioned by their geographical situation. As stated in the history, 'it is generally the case that the Border nobility

abounds in men: that of Lothian being strong in wealth rather than men' (p.44). Obviously a wealthy chief could reward or pay for his followers. A superfluity of men in the Borders meant they would have to, to a certain extent, search for themselves. There was also the frontier factor which must have affected their behaviour. As is pointed out, they were in the habit of changing sides to protect their property when it looked as if the English were going to gain the upper hand, and no doubt the same applied on the other side when the Scots had the mastery. Even the style of warfare is described by Godscroft: the Border custom of drawing swords as if to attack and either terrorising the enemy or causing alarm as to their intentions, and if any suitable opportunity presented taking it. 'At the same time as they are hindering the enemy and throwing it into confusion they are warning their friends to come to their assistance' (p.31).

The importance of horses to the Borderers is evident: they went to battle with two horses and used the poorer of the two as a decoy, as the opportunity to capture horses was sought on both sides of the Border and the horse was seen as one of the most attractive spoils of war. The Borderers' skill as horsemen is also exemplified, as is the fact that they could transfer from one horse to the other and even unsaddle a horse while in full flight. The sight of de la Bastie on David's



chief's horse was obviously (p.32) a contributory factor in the ensuing murder. A good horse was as much a status symbol then as a performance car is today, but could also mean the difference between life and death. Repeatedly the possibility of escape from capture is shown to depend on the swiftness of the horse and its type of caparison. The author's father's horses are given special mention, sought out for him 'either in the north of Scotland or England' (p.52) and a matter of pride. One of the attractions of the inhabitants of Kimmerghame for the author's brother was that they possessed 'very fine horses' (p.64).

Adding to the patrimony was ranked very high on the list of priorities, being a measure of success and status. Here the end justified the means whether by murder, mayhem or marriage. As well as adding to property there was also the matter of teinds and control of such plums, or perhaps more appropriately apples of discord as Coldingham priory, coveted and contested for by the Humes, Blackadders and Stewarts, and occasioning more than one murder. But marriage was the most obvious way of adding to the patrimony and the fate of previous husbands a mere incidental, e.g. David the second 'captured and led to deserved punishment' Robert Graham the murderer of King James and then married his widow Elizabeth Carmichael who added Strafontane to the patrimony. George the first and his brother Patrick

married Marion and Margaret Sinclair, sole heirs of John Sinclair, whereby Polwarth was added to the Wedderburn estate; David the fourth married Blackadder's widow and so added Hilton to the patrimony but equally important by marrying his brothers to his stepdaughters, the sole heirs of the Blackadder estate, he founded the Humes of Blackadder. George the second married Joanna Hepburn to get possession of Thirlestane and it was obviously a matter of some regret to the author that his father did not enhance his patrimony as he 'neither increased or decreased it but left it as he found it'.

Perhaps most surprising is how Godscroft describes his father and brother taking the law into their own hands at the same time as stating they were upright, honest and just. When his father David the fifth was not appointed Warden of the East Marches and the post was given to Coldenknowes he refused to acknowledge him, 'did not go to his meetings or allow any of his people to honour him or show him respect' (p.46). Since a main function of the post was to settle complaints both with and against the English, Wedderburn refused to participate and dealt with matters himself. 'If anything was to be gained from the English he sought it in private and the matter was settled in private'. After George the author's brother had been detained in Perth for six months he found that 'various fierce quarrels with his relatives awaited his return' (p.76). Obviously a firm hand had to be present

at all times to ensure peace and respect with the lead given by a strong central government. But George 'stubbornly administered his own law' with the court in opposition. The sad fact is that for much of the period covered by the History there was not a strong central government but minorities, a succession of regencies and civil war. The description of Godscroft's grandfather's activities make him out to be nothing less than a thug and little better than a brigand. But these were especially troubled times and Godscroft explains his actions as 'the state of affairs at that time was the greatest confusion' - the aftermath of Flodden. 'Everyone', alleges Godscroft, 'even the most moderate were constrained to do everything by force and not in a legal manner and to defend themselves and their own by arms'. Certainly the apparent lawlessness and violence which prevails throughout the History must be seen against the background of what was happening nationally but which Godscroft tends to gloss over or give the merest mention, presumably because he felt that such matters could be read in any number of histories or were common knowledge to his nephew and that a national history was beyond his particular remit.

On the subject of education Godscroft, with perhaps a note of bitterness in view of his own career, states that in general learning was not respected. Although one of his father's brothers and a grand uncle, younger sons,

had acquired degrees, 'education at that time was not considered necessary among the upper ranks - even now it is not so deemed by them'. But it is a subject close to his own heart and so 'there is a detailed description of both his father's and elder brother's education. About his father he states 'he had a knowledge of the Latin language beyond others of his name who studied arms alone even as they do today' (p.43). He had been brought up 'honourably and in a splendid house' mainly to ride, throw the javelin and dice, but he had also attended the Academy and studied logic. Religion was important to him and his favourite psalms and precepts (p.43) are quoted. He certainly was not a follower of Machiavelli according to Godscroft, who remembered him arguing against the thesis of the end justifying the means (p.44). George, Godscroft's brother's education was not noticeably different: his education was that of the Renaissance man. Educated at Dunbar he became so proficient in Latin prose and verse composition that 'no one at that time was thought to equal him in any school in Scotland' (p.60). Again knowledge of the Scriptures is stressed. George was then educated along with Archibald earl of Angus at the behest of Regent Morton, their teacher being John Provan who taught him logic, and reference is made to Rutherford's Compendium (p.60). The education he was thus receiving was that of a courtier and was also doubtless affected by Morton's lengthy stay south of the



Border. George learned French, studied History, Geography, Geometry and Philosophy and if one is to believe his brother, he was also remarkable 'for the breadth of his knowledge in politics, economics, agriculture and cattle rearing', all this in addition to singing in the fashion of the court, accompanying himself on the harp, and 'dancing without ostentation' (p.61). A keen hunter, he used dogs and falcons and became an authority on falcons and tercelles, knowing their characteristics, haunts and flight paths. Needless to say he was an expert horseman and archer, and because he was kept short of money by his stepmother, played chess rather than dice or cards as was the custom at court. Such an education was not dissimilar to that of the royal princes in Scotland or England. Godscroft's opinion of his brother's abilities was that he could have become among the greatest in terms of scholarship 'but it was the held opinion about nobility that letters were unbecoming and so he was dragged away from education' (p.61).

All of this gives a very detailed description of the education of the day for the upper echelons of society but also the prevailing attitude towards education. Moreover, younger sons could indulge in the luxury of university and a life of letters so long as money was abundant, but if not then the studies had to come to an end as in the case of the author himself who was recalled

from his study visit to Europe to get on with the real business of managing the estate. This meant maintaining the power and influence of the family in the locality, winning the respect of clients and neighbours alike and exerting an active lordship.

And it is as a man of action that the author portrays himself. Although he refers more than once to his proclivity for letters, this is not emphasised. He does not figure in the History as the historian, writer and poet, as he is known to posterity; rather it is as his brother's strong right arm, helping him impose his idea of justice, law and order. When his brother was in trouble over his connection with Morton and Angus it was Godscroft who acted as agent, staying at Elphinston and 'making the most discreet and searching investigation' (p.74). Acting as his brother's adviser, he was largely responsible for his survival, no mean feat when the opposition was Arran. George's absence in the custody of Gowrie was the opportunity for predators. Crainshaws, also a Hume, took possession of land near Ramrig. It was the author, referred to throughout in the third person, who roused the tenants and his brother's retainers and rallied help from his brother-in-law at Langton. He dealt with the animadversions of Joanna Hepburn. Nor does he omit to point out that he gave up his own lands to preserve family harmony, keeping only the teinds of Darnchester. But it was the dispute with the Kerrs that



saw him at his most active: when his sister had been humiliated by being rejected by her husband it was David who urged force on his sister's behalf and who took obvious pleasure in his account of the besting of Kerr. As he himself states 'it was a known fact that a wrong ignored encouraged another' (p.67). The final picture in the History is of him masterminding the local skirmish and triumphing in this matter of honour.

And it is as men of action that Godscroft portrays himself, his family and his ancestors: fighting, feuding, dealing out justice, adding to the patrimony, by force if necessary and continuing the honour culture of the knight leading his men into battle and fighting for chief, prince and country. This is the example and message to be absorbed by the young Wedderburn for whom the History was written.

That the History was written in Latin is no surprise. Latin was the language of the educated as Sir David Lindsay states so appositely in his 'Ane Dialogue betwix Experience and the Courteour', intended for 'colyearis, cairtaris and cukis' and hence written in the vernacular. 'The centre of all studies was the Latin tongue and its literature and the ars grammatica was still the language of education'.<sup>27</sup> At Dunbar grammar school Godscroft would learn as well as the rudiments, Latin grammar and rhetoric. He then proceeded to St Leonard's College in St Andrews where even in 1642 all the students 'speak

Latine among themselves least the necessary use of the Latine tongue weare out of use'. As a result of Scotland supporting Pedro de Luna and of Flodden, the substance of the medieval arts curriculum - despite the efforts of Andrew Melville in establishing a Ramist curriculum at St Mary's - remained firmly entrenched in many Scottish colleges. That meant the study of various works of Aristotle, logic, rhetoric, politics, ethics, physics and astronomy, read in Latin. But even in England where education proceeded along different lines, Latin was the language of the educated. 'Thou are a scholar Horatio, speak to it', emphasises the connection between Latin as the language of the educated and of eternity. It was seen as the language of theology, diplomacy and posterity.

But classical Latin was in itself too limiting. Generally agreed to have been founded by Petrarch, neo Latin overcame that problem. Intended to get away from the bastard Latin and barbarisms of the Middle Ages, neo Latin was a return to the principles of classical Latin, augmented by vocabulary and grammar to meet the current needs of expression. 'In literature the neo Latin movement often involved close imitation of classical models that in turn engendered new forms to supplement or modify the traditional kinds of expression developed in both Latin and the vernacular during the Middle Ages'.<sup>28</sup> Starting with the early Humanists, by the end of the

Renaissance the geographical extent of neo Latin was nearly total. Boccaccio, Pannonino, Vives, Owen, More and Erasmus were just some of the authors of European stature who wrote both in neo Latin and in the vernacular, and many important vernacular works, for example Castiglione's Il Cortegiano, were turned into Latin in order to reach an international audience. Buchanan, on whom Godscroft modelled himself, chose to speak to an international audience by using Latin. And so in this respect Godscroft was part of an important international movement and had the potential for reaching a far wider audience than if he had written in the vernacular. Although the Wedderburn History was not written for such deliberately, it was in keeping with the great corpus of neo Latin literature being produced at the time and for years to come. In fact long after Hume's death Latin remained the international language of theology, philosophy, jurisprudence, mathematics, medicine and the natural sciences.

Evidence of Godscroft's erudition can be seen throughout his work. There are copious classical allusions, those quoted below being merely a representative sample. There is the essential epithet for Achilles 'o us wkus' (p.51);<sup>29</sup> the reference to Helen of Troy 'ab ovo gemino' (p.5);<sup>30</sup> the mention of the highest award for military prowess as the 'corona circa' (p.51),<sup>31</sup> which was given to soldiers for bravery in

Classical Rome. Woven into the text are quotations from Caesar - 'capitis diminutio' (p.68),<sup>32</sup> Cicero - 'alma fides' (p.57)<sup>33</sup> and Pliny - 'aequa lance pensitavit' (p.66)<sup>34</sup> as well as quotations from more obscure authors such as Tibullus - 'ignem foribus admovet' (p.65).<sup>35</sup> Granted that most Humanist scholars would have at their disposal Torrentius 'Elucidarius carminum et historiarum' and 'Calepinus Dictionarium' as well as their own personal notebooks of quotations, nevertheless there is evidence in Godscroft's writing of copious and careful reading of classical writers in the best Humanist tradition. In terms of style, there are echoes of Tacitus, for example when describing the fate of Morton, 'primo carce deinde caedes et exitium' (p.73) and the rhetoric which is constantly invoked is the obvious product of the study of Cicero and Livy, most notable being the lengthy diatribe on oathbreaking after the killing of the Hume brothers. Moreover there are several references intended for the equally well-read reader. An example of this is the witty riposte of David the fifth to Morton, punning on the words 'iure liberatus' (p.48)<sup>36</sup> which is a direct reference to Cicero. Again there is the use of 'purgatio' or ritual cleansing in connection with Bowmakar after eating the 'pultes' or food of the ritual chickens. But as well as genuine erudition there is also the element of pedantry in giving alternative Latin or Greek forms of an English name -

Strathfontanis or Fontovallis (p.10), Gleneglisus or Vallaquilius (p.58), Bowmakarius or Toxopoium (p.17), Turnbullus or Strephotaurus. But Godscroft was not alone in this: when one examines a letter sent to him by Andrew Melville one finds exactly this sort of tone with words in Greek and allusions to classical writers. And even though written in English the History of the House of Douglas and Angus contains many Latin quotations and in particular references to Cicero, Cato and Livy, so dear to the Humanists.<sup>37</sup> The unacknowledged references would be obvious to the classical reader: 'great Antiquity is commonly accompanied with much uncertainty' (p.1) is almost directly from Livy,<sup>38</sup> and the complaint about the destruction of records by Edward is evocative of Livy<sup>39</sup> and Plutarch.<sup>40</sup> The statement in the Preface about the importance of motive and judgement in the writing of history 'without which it were little better and an old wife's tale' is, moreover, an echo of Aulus Gallius.<sup>41</sup> Even the actions of the individuals he is writing about are measured against classical standards with allusions to the Fabii Cornелиi and Marcelli, Scipio, Cyneas and Pyrrhus, Diogenes and Alexander.

The more one examines Godscroft's Histories, the more one is conscious that he was profoundly influenced by the Classical tradition and based his historiography on the examples of Greek and Roman writers. He can be seen as a worthy successor to them. The incorporation of legend

and oral tradition is a feature of his writing but so it was with Xenophon and Livy and in fact can be traced back to Hecataeus. Greek in origin was the utilitarian concept of history as a practical guide, providing through history ethical lessons. When Livy stated 'what chiefly makes the study of history wholesome and profitable is this that you behold the lessons of every kind of experience set forth as on a conspicuous monument; from these you may choose for yourself and for your own state what to imitate, from these mark for avoidance what is shameful in the conception and shameful in the result',<sup>42</sup> he was speaking for a whole tradition starting with Thucydides and to be continued by Tacitus and Herodian. Livy's words are echoed in Godscroft's Preface to his nephew in the Wedderburn History. Livy's emphasis was on the ancient qualities of heroism, patriotism and a sense of duty. In fact this is summed up by David Allan: 'Scotland from the later sixteenth until at least the early eighteenth century should be seen as a nation in which historians were obliged again and again to reinterpret their own political experience in the variable light cast by a distinctively humanist analysis of history'.<sup>43</sup>

Both Histories catalogue patriotic behaviour, proof of which is given in the number of the respective families who died in battle with valour and courage being implicit. For example, when George the first was found



dead after Kella it is pointed out that the wounds were to the front. The 'virtus' that Godscroft prioritises in the Wedderburn History and defines in the History of the House of Douglas as 'the ground without which the rest are never well built' is the self same virtue which was the essence of the free Roman about which Brutus composed a volume.<sup>44</sup> 'Privilege and station imposed duties to family class and equals in the first place, but also towards clients and dependants'<sup>45</sup> and this is patent in the Wedderburn History. Also in the History, particularly with reference to George the author's brother and Godscroft himself, moderation is stressed, reminiscent of the words of the Delphic oracle.<sup>46</sup>

Even the emphasis on the individual which is exemplified in both Histories and which is identified so much with Calvinist writers had its origins in Classical writing. Plutarch emphasised outstanding personages rather than broad historical forces as did Cicero stressing the role of individuals in the course of events with the resultant subordination or neglect of wider issues. Imperial rule in Rome not surprisingly increased biography, leading eventually to the panegyric and here again there are parallels with Godscroft's writing. Just as the funeral oration was used as a means of justifying claims to noble descent and recalled past glories of the house, so it can be said Godscroft's Histories fulfilled the same purpose, particularly with

the verse at the end summing up the virtues of the subject. Similarly the writing of the History of the House of Douglas and Angus was mainly to justify a claim to a dukedom and the writing of the History of the House of Wedderburn most likely was meant to show that the Humes of Wedderburn were every bit as good as the followers of James who had accompanied him south and had been honoured accordingly. Nor is it surprising that the prosopography associated with the 'imagines' tracing the family ancestors should have had its Humanist counterpart in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century obsession with genealogy. Not only was that a core of Godscroft's work but is evident in other family histories written at this time. There is a genealogical tree at Hatfield House claiming Elizabeth's descent from Adam. John Jonson wrote poems on the 107 kings of Scotland<sup>47</sup> dating from Fergus and it was obviously with the same spirit that James VI on his way south insisted on adding his statue to the line of kings in York Minster.

The Humanists valued history and looking at things through a historical perspective whereby they could understand present day problems and moralise, as history provided moral and political lessons. They also adopted the didactic role of the classical writers. Just as Aristotle's 'On Monarchy' and 'On Colonists' was written for the instruction of Alexander and Cato wrote an encyclopaedia and gnostic book of morality for his son, so

the Humanist took on the role of instructor. Pitscottie uses James V as an example to all kings and princes of the fate of the ungodly.<sup>48</sup> Lesley's aim was the political instruction of Mary Queen of Scots;<sup>49</sup> with his royal pupil in mind, Buchanan referred to his History as 'faithful Counsellors from History that you might make use of their Advice'.<sup>50</sup> Melville of Halhill wrote his Memoirs with the aim of providing advice on how to become a royal servant.<sup>51</sup> Monro in his dedication<sup>52</sup> refers to his writings as 'worthy counsellors' and Milton in his Introduction was to see his function as 'with plain and lightsom brevity to relate well and orderly things worth noting so as may best instruct and benefit them that read'.<sup>53</sup> As the Jesuits were to concentrate on the Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns and the 'philosophes' on the European monarchs of the eighteenth century, so Godscroft wrote a History with a purpose for his nephew, to underline the criteria for leadership in society by quoting example and providing comment upon it.

But although steeped in the Classical historiographical tradition, Godscroft's writing shows evidence of his Scottish literary heritage and of the times in which he was writing. The copious references to Boece, Major and Buchanan show his familiarity with earlier Scottish histories and allusions to Camden and Holinshed show that he was also aware of what was being written south of the border. But more than that, he was

part of a cohort of writers who had shown an awareness of Scottish heritage and traditions as being quite distinct. Starting before the Wars of Independence a 'shared identity fostered by the myths of the past'<sup>54</sup> characterised Scotland by 1200 and reached its apogee in the reply to Edward I's submission to Boniface and the Declaration of Arbroath. Barbour's Brus (1375) and Walter Bower's Scotichronicon (c.1440) were manifestations of a combination of freedom and patriotism as well as awareness of national identity, produced most likely in reply to the threat of the childless King David's suggestion that England and Scotland be united under Edward or his son. When Boece wrote his History it incorporated these sentiments and underlined them. Even Major, although an advocate of union with England, could be termed a patriotic writer in the same way as Godscroft, and as Godscroft railed against the inaccuracies of Camden so did he against Caxton. Both were anxious not just for accuracy but for fair treatment of their native land. Major was writing in the aftermath of Flodden, Godscroft of the Union of the Crowns. 'Ane Resonyng of Ane Scottis and Inglis Merchand'<sup>55</sup> and 'The Complaynt of Scotland'<sup>56</sup> were further manifestations of a country struggling to preserve its national identity in the face of the 'Rough Wooing'. Even Buchanan and Knox, although partisan and tied emotionally and intellectually to Calvinism, used

history to assert the special nature of Scotland - 'Scots are acknowledged to be among the first who embraced the Faith of Christ'.<sup>57</sup> This was the corpus of Scottish writing which Godscroft drew on and the intellectual inheritance that manifests itself in his work. This was what he was meaning when he referred to 'nostrates' or 'our writers'.

Love of country is manifest in both Histories and the positive exemplification of nationalism: in the History of the House of Douglas and Angus the acts of cruelty of the English are highlighted and the policy of Edward I in relation to Scottish records is fulminated against repeatedly. This is not merely the indignation of a historian at the destruction of source material but horror at what it symbolised: the loss of national identity. In the Wedderburn History due emphasis is given to the participation of the family in the Border campaigns and in famous battles such as Wark, Mellerstain and Flodden. But a telling point is the statement that love of country and hatred of the English was such that no matter how he was treated at home, David the fourth could never be induced to take refuge with the English or to seek English assistance.

But coupled with the strong nationalistic literary inheritance was that of Calvin. Recognition of a broadly humanist and historical approach to the justification of the Calvinist position seems to have moved many

committed Scotsmen to follow Knox's example in the writing of history.<sup>58</sup> Godscroft is seen to be a Calvinist writer. In both Histories the emphasis is on the individual and there are numerous references to the will of God. In the History of the House of Douglas and Angus, the initial address to the Reader begins with a statement of 'God's Providence guiding and ruling the world and men's actions' and that the study of history leads to God. 'Our last end' he states, 'should ever lie to God and Christ', with God 'not being found but in Christ' and to be 'sought above all things'. When describing the aggression of Edward in Scotland the comment is made 'we observe God's Providence (p.22) towards this Kingdome in preserving the liberties thereof'. But it must be remembered that Catholic writers also referred to Providence. And he also refers to 'the wheel of worldly affairs (which men call fortune)' which is harking back very much to Polybius. Again after Duplin he refers to God 'concerning the liberty of this country' (p.61). 'So doth God blinde the wisdom of unjust men when he hath a work to do against them' (p.63) is how he explains the conduct of the two king Edwards. The occasion at Abercorn when Douglas did not make the most of his chance to defeat Angus and King James is explained as 'the providence of God who had not determined to give the Crowne to the Douglas'. Here we have a combining of the Humanist philosophy as portrayed



by Polybius and even more so by Tacitus,<sup>59</sup> who stressed the role of fortune but also divine intervention and predestination, with the Calvinist concept of national election and solemn thanksgiving or recognition which had to be celebrated. 'If we prove unthankfull after all these mercies we may justly expect to be re-inslaved',<sup>60</sup> written in England in 1641, sums up this sentiment, evidence of which can be found in the Powder Treason sermons of 1605 and Godscroft's own poem on the subject of the Gunpowder plot.

In the Wedderburn History there is not so much reference to the will of God other than in the preface and with reference to the fate of Hepburn, but one is made very much aware of the times in which Godscroft was writing: there is considerable emphasis on the Bible. He states that his father, although of the old faith (p.43), constantly referred to the Scriptures and the importance of putting one's hope in God. He also quoted psalms by number and his favourite precepts. One is also given an insight into the practices of and attitude to the begging brothers when his grandmother took exception to their alleged miracle. Although she had been brought up in the Roman faith, on her deathbed she refused to kiss the crucifix and made the protestant statement about believing (p.48) in 'God alone, her sure Salvation'. Godscroft's brother was brought up to be conversant with the Bible and the instance is quoted when as a child he

consoled his mother by reading to her the fourth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians (p.60) Similarly he tells how his brother translated the mass for his wife so that she could see its weakness (p.61). There is, however, no mention of the religious aspects of the civil war. And the part played by the family in supporting Mary is explained as loyalty to the crown, even though their chief Alexander and cousin James Morton were on the other side. When this caused doubt in Bothwell's mind David the author's father answered that Mary was his prince and as such he would act earnestly for her. Even the changing of sides is similarly explained: when the Queen abdicated (and it is significant that the word used is abdicated not deposed), substituted her son, named tutors for him and the matter was decided by law and ratified by the Estates, he then with the same loyalty obeyed the king and although he himself did not fight at Langside he sent his men under the command of his uncle John. One gets a real sense of the confusion of the period with the statement that at the same time the chief Alexander defected to the Queen's side; obviously the motives were wide-ranging but no explanation or comment is made by Godscroft. His main concern is with the family.

It is evident why the earl of Angus chose to have his family history written by Godscroft. Although he had been servitor of the family and was related to them, it

was not for these reasons. It was because Godscroft was one of the leading intellects of his day, of renowned integrity and an expert in putting a case, - and after all they were putting forward a case for title and recognition. But more than that he could immortalise them and so he did. The History of the House of Douglas and Angus is one of the few family histories to be part of the mainstream of Scottish historiography.

Sadly the History of the Humes of Wedderburn is not so well known as it should be, containing as it does detailed information on the area Godscroft knew so well and providing a valuable insight into the honour culture of the sixteenth century, by someone who actually participated in the events described.

Although there is obvious partiality, it is admitted and although Godscroft's style tends to the panegyric and his rhetoric is at times tedious, nonetheless the reader is presented with a logical, orderly and very readable account, through which shines the author's love of his country above all else. As he himself states, he could have merely collated existing histories, but instead he subjected them to comparison and critical historical analysis, giving the reader the benefit of his considered judgement and scholarship. Furthermore his access to original documents put him in a unique position, the importance of which he appreciated, hence the inclusion of references and documents within the text, and the list

of bonds at the end of the manuscript History of the House of Douglas and Angus is something for which future generations will be grateful. He was not just writing of the past for the present, he was also writing for the future. And in his writing and as an individual he acts as a link between the past and the future - writing in neo Latin which harked back to the past, and in the formal vernacular which would finally prevail; and as a Humanist steeped in the Classical tradition but also showing how easy was the transition from Humanism to Calvinism. One calls to mind Jefferson's statement about Tacitus: 'his book is a compound of history, and morality of which we know no other example'. Obviously he had not read Godscroft.

## NOTES

## CHAPTER FOUR

1. Henceforth referred to as Godscroft for clarity, in view of the number of Humes dealt with in this chapter.
2. D Allan, Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment (Edinburgh, 1993) [Allan, Virtue], 61.
3. C McGladdery, James II (Edinburgh, 1990), 23.
4. R.M.S i, 875, 876.
5. Thomas Thomson, former keeper of the SRO, has listed chronological differences in Miscellaneous Notes on Hume of Godscroft RH 13, 30. I am indebted to Peter Veasey for drawing this to my attention.
6. SRO, GD 267.
7. There is, however, a verse dedicated to him in the Poemata Omnia.
8. Berwickshire Naturalist Club, xii, 102.
9. R.M.S, ii, 1781, 1919, 1893.
10. Rhymer, Foedera, xiii, 761.
11. Thomas Ruddiman, Epistolae Jacobi Quarti, Jacobi Quinti et Mariae Regum Scotorum (Edinburgh, 1722-4) [Ruddiman, Epistolae] i, 211.
12. Nat. Lib. 439.
13. Ruddiman, Epistolae, i, 227.
14. M P Rooseboom, The Scottish Staple in the Netherlands (The Hague, 1910), App. No. 38.
15. M Lynch, Scotland: a New History (London 1991) [Lynch, New History], 163.
16. Ibid., 163: 'Albany ... offered pensions, security and a return to the glittering years of James IV'.
17. Diurnal of Occurrents, 6.
18. St Andrews Formulare i, 49-51, 13-15.
19. HMC Hume, xii, App. pt. 8, no. 255; ADCP 353.

20. M Dilworth, 'Coldingham Priory and the Reformation', Innes Review, xxiii (1972), 115.
21. J Wormald, Lords and Men in Scotland, 1442-1603 (Edinburgh 1985), 79.
22. Sir Robert Douglas, The Baronage of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1798), ii, 174.
23. Patrick had been involved in a dispute with John Hume of Jedburgh over the fruits of Coldingham and was killed by the Humes of Wedderburn. T. Rae, The Administration of the Scottish Frontier 1513-1603 (Edinburgh 1966), 162.
24. The Maitland Miscellany (Maitland Soc., 1833-47), ii, 38.
25. K Brown, Bloodfeud in Scotland 1573-1625 (Edinburgh 1986), 16.
26. Ibid., 17.
27. J. Scotland, A History of Scottish Education, 2 vols. (London, 1969), i, 17.
28. L Ryan, 'Neo Latin Literature in the Present State of Scholarship', in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Literature, ed. Jones (Missouri, 1978), 198.
29. Homer, Iliad.
30. Horace, Ars Poetica, 147.
31. Livy, Ab Urbe Condita, 6, 20, 7.
32. Caesar, Bellum Gallicum, 2, 32, 9.
33. Cicero, De Officiis, 3, 29, 104.
34. Pliny, Historia Naturalis, 7, 7, 5.
35. Tibullus, Elegies 3.
36. Cicero, In Verrem 2, 1, 46.
37. J MacQueen, 'Aspects of Humanism in 16th and 17th century Literature', in J MacQueen (ed.), Humanism in Renaissance Scotland (Edinburgh, 1990), 19.
38. Livy, Ab Urbe Condita 8, 40, 3-5.
39. Ibid., 6, 1, 1-3.



40. Plutarch, Life of Numa, 1, 1-2.
41. Aulus Gellius, Attic Nights 5, 18, 6-9.
42. Livy, Ab Urbe Condita, Preface.
43. Allan, Virtue, 44.
44. Brutus, De Officiis.
45. R Syme, The Roman Revolution (Oxford, 1939), 59. He argues that this was a peculiarly Roman quality.
46. Nothing in excess.
47. John Johnson was commissioned by James VI to trace his ancestry. Inscriptiones Historicae Regum Scotorum in Deliciae Poetarum Scotorum (Edinburgh, 1637).
48. R Lindsay, The History of Scotland from 1436-1565, ed. Freebairn (Edinburgh, 1728), 178.
49. J Lesley, The History of Scotland (Bannatyne Club, 1830), 3-5.
50. G Buchanan, The History of Scotland, ed. Fraser (London, 1690), Biv.
51. Sir J Melville, Memoires (London, 1693), a2v.
52. R Monro, Monro, His Expedition with the Worthy Scots Regiment etc. (London, 1637), 2v.
53. J Milton, History of Britain (London, 1671), CPv4; also N von Mattzahn, Tudor Historical Thought (San Marino, 1967), 237-85.
54. E Cowan, 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland', S.H.R., lxiii (1984), 135.
55. W Lamb, (c.1494-1550), Ane Resonyng of Ane Scottis and Inglis Merchand (incomplete c.1549); see R J Lyall, 'Vernacular Prose before the Reformation' in The History of Scottish Literature, i, ed. R D S Jack (Aberdeen, 1988), 175-176.
56. R Wedderburn, Complaynt of Scotland (Paris, 1550). See also A M Stewart, The Complaynt of Scotland (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1979), pp.vii-xx.
57. J Knox, The Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland (London, 1644), bir.
58. Allan, Virtue, 46.

59. N Lewis and M Reinhold, Roman Civilisation: Selected Readings (New York, 1990), 13, 26.
60. J Milton, God's Free Mercy to England (London, 1641/2), 24-5.

CHAPTER FIVE  
GODSCROFT THE POET

Throughout Godscroft's life he was recognised as much as a poet as a historian. The posthumous fame of the History of the House of Douglas and Angus tended to obfuscate this fact. Although it is true to say that most gentlemen of the period from the king downwards wrote poetry of varying quality, Godscroft was relatively unusual in having much of his poetry published in his lifetime, and included in the Delicial Poetarum Scotorum, for inclusion in which collection many poets were prepared if not to kill at least to rewrite.<sup>1</sup> Thanks to the educational system which obtained at the time and which Godscroft himself refers to,<sup>2</sup> his poetry was written in neo Latin, as was most of the scholarly work in Europe at that time. In fact it would have been unthinkable to have written in any other medium and it is significant that Godscroft styled himself 'Theagrius', a name which would have meaning throughout Europe. Even in the copious correspondence of Scot of Scotstarvit<sup>3</sup> in the seventeenth century, of the 235 letters extant only one is in English and even so is introducing a Latin poem.

Unfortunately general anthologies tend to omit neo Latin poetry and, although there has been work on European Latin poetry and in particular French neo Latin

poetry, with the exception of the work of I D Macfarlane and Ford and Watt on the subject of Buchanan's writing, neo Latin poetry in Scotland has aroused scant attention, with some anthologies leaping quite unashamedly from Dunbar to the eighteenth century. Even in the scholarly four-volume History of Scottish Literature<sup>4</sup> it is accorded twelve pages, six of which are taken up with Buchanan. It is worth quoting Professor MacQueen's statement in the aforesaid chapter:

From about 1500 there was a great increase in the production of Latin verse and for a century and a half numerous Scotsmen found an effective means of expression in the classical tongue. But it must be stressed that what they produced was in many cases not merely Latin verse composed by Scotsmen. It was in a real sense Scottish poetry and it holds an important place in any assessment of Scottish literature as a whole.<sup>5</sup>

That the purpose of history was to instruct was obvious. It was written and read as a text book of private and public virtue, the strengths and honour of those who had gone before to be copied, their weaknesses and transgressions to be avoided. It was not quite so obvious that the function of poetry was also to instruct as well as delight, and from earliest times the poet was regarded as having special powers and privileges arising from these powers. As well as advising and warning, the poet was believed to be able to prophesy. In Celtic culture it was the poet who presented the wand and sceptre at a king's inauguration, composed an inaugural ode and recited the king's pedigree of which he was also

the compiler.<sup>6</sup> Panegyric, genealogy, historical or quasi-historical accounts were all part of the poet's repertoire and the line between history and poetry was faint. In classical times the 'vates' was seen as the medium or mouthpiece of a divine power possessing him, the process being related to poetic inspiration. The works of Homer and Virgil combine poetry with history and genealogy in the same way as their Celtic counterparts. In the case of Virgil, his fame as prophet lasted until the end of the seventeenth century, owing to the fact that in the fourth Eclogue he looks forward to the birth of a marvellous infant who will usher in a golden age: this was believed to be prophesying the birth of Christ<sup>7</sup> And just as random opening of the Bible was used to discover prophetic advice and direct action so was Virgil used for rhapsodomancy.<sup>8</sup> However the association of poetry with prophecy was particularly relevant in an era that was looking forward to the Apocalypse.

With the panegyric the role of the poet is most clear. The original in Greece was a speech or declaration composed for a special event such as the Olympic festival, the best known examples being the Panegyrics of Isocrates in which Isocrates urged Athens and Sparta to unite against Persia. Advice was thus a very significant part of the panegyric. The Latin panegyric derived quite simply from the funeral oration with the emphasis, as one would expect, on eulogy. The

'laudatio' and 'gratiarum actio' were the most significant elements. Not surprisingly in imperial Rome, the focus became the emperor. The humanists who adopted this medium substituted the king and so one finds throughout the reign of James VI a flood of such poems, both in the vernacular and in Latin: starting with Patrick Adamson's 'Genethliacum Serenissimi Scotia Anglia et Hiberniae Principis Jacobi VI' in 1566, and reaching a high-water mark in 1617 with such as Drummond's 'Forth Feasting'.<sup>9</sup> Anderson's 'Panegyris ad Jacobum', Danskin's 'Ad Regem Penegyricus', Dempster's 'Panegyricus Jacobi', Crichton's 'Congratulatio ad Jacobum' and Maitland's 'Ad Jacobum Sextum' are but a few of the titles in the Deliciae Poetarum Scotorum. Evidently you could not consider yourself a poet or more appropriately be considered as such by others unless you addressed the King.

Godscroft addressed several poems to James. 'De Jacobo VI Rege adhuc puero, Expectatio' was probably the first. Although it is not known when this was written and just how young the king was at the time, it is obvious that the poet must have been young himself since, although his exact birth year is not known, he was roughly contemporary with the king, at most eight years older than him.<sup>10</sup>



This poem is typical of much of Godscroft's work. Most evident is the classical education, the familiarity with a complete range of classical authors and their works and thorough knowledge of quantities. Even the theme is classical: James will usher in a golden age.<sup>11</sup>

A miniature geography lesson, the poem begins with a description of the world's wealth: England with its flocks of sheep, France with its vines, the gold-bearing rivers Tagus and Sarabat and the Ganges with its gems, the grapes and honey of Sicily, the perfumes of Arabia. Even Rome is included for having produced leaders like the Fabii, the Caesars and, by inference, Pompey. Scotland is referred to as lying hid for so many years buried in unworthy darkness, 'indignis tenebris sepulta' (l. 24), but now becoming more famous than any of them 'iam cunctis clarior oris' (l. 25). And this is where the element of prophecy occurs: James in maturity 'plenis maturior annis' (l. 37) will bring about a Golden Age when Scottish rivers will produce gold and gems, the Caledonian oaks will exude dewy honey 'mella Caledoniae sudabunt roscida quercus' (l. 47) and

Thura manabunt tribulis ruboque

Pendebit potior Campanis una racemis (ll. 48-49)

(Perfume will flow from the water chestnuts, from the bramble, the grape will hang richer than that of Campania)

It will be perpetual spring with roses and lilies in bloom constantly and no irksome cold will harm the corn, 'non gelu pigrum Cereri nocebit'. But most important, whereas both sides of the Tweed have been too much shaken with the storms of war,

At nunc perpetuam spondent tibi sydera pacem  
Et locant regno medium Britanno (ll. 81-82)  
(The stars will give you everlasting peace and place you in the middle of the kingdom of Britain).

The elegiac couplet in which the poem is written conforms to the Latin concept of the self-contained couplet and the poem shows skilful balance with a natural break occurring with the reference to James, the first part being the world of the past and the four lines referring to James acting as a bridge between the old and the new. The classical references are copious with echoes of Pliny, Virgil, Ovid and Livy in the use of names such as Lydius Pactolus (l. 5),<sup>12</sup> Hermus (l. 6),<sup>13</sup> Maesia (l. 9),<sup>14</sup> Trinacris Hybla (l. 11),<sup>15</sup> as well as the eponyms Thure... Sabaei (l. 12),<sup>16</sup> Murice... Tyrrii (l. 13).<sup>17</sup> Even the Virgilian form of Ceres 'cereri' (l. 68)<sup>18</sup> is employed. The allusion to Pompey (ll. 17-21) shows detailed knowledge of Roman history: Pompey's mobilisation of his forces in Macedonia, flight to Egypt after Pharsalus and subsequent murder at the command of Caesar his father-in-law, all of which was probably derived from reading Plutarch's Parallel Lives Agesilaus-Pompey. The notion of Phoebus (l. 27) and the Furies (l. 80) gives further evidence of knowledge of classical

mythology and it is assumed that the reader would understand the allusion to Phoebus's sister (l. 27) Diana without her being named. Exact words and quotations from the classics are incorporated into the text, but generally rearranged, e.g. 'nec supertes Integer'<sup>19</sup> becomes 'Integer ... supertes' (l. 36). Perhaps the most obvious example is Virgil's 'quercus sudabunt roscida mella'<sup>20</sup> (l. 13) becoming 'mella ... sudabunt roscida quercus' (l. 47).

The treatment is not unlike that of Patrick Adamson's 'Genethliacum Serenissimi Scotia Anglia et Hibernia Principis Jacobi VI' of 1566, where James is portrayed as the Sun but similarly creating a Golden Age. He too highlights the Tweed but instead of sitting in the middle of the kingdom, in Adamson's poem it returns to the sea. We are told that Godscroft also composed a Genethliacum<sup>21</sup> while a student but only a few lines of it have survived.

However the panegyric which conforms most to the traditional Greek pattern is the 'Regi Suo Scotiae Gratulatio' celebrating the visit of James VI in 1617 and written to be declaimed publicly as part of the festivities along with several other panegyrics from the leading poets of the day, e.g. Goldman's 'Sylva ad Regem Scotiam suam revisentem', Wedderburn's 'Synenphranterion in reditu Regis in Scotiam 1617'<sup>22</sup> as well as Drummond's 'Forth Feasting' and many other utterances that would hardly qualify as verse, far less poetry. It has been

stated that 'any writer who could put together a verb, noun and three adjectives gushed forth effusive praise of the king and his home town'<sup>23</sup> at this time. The feature of Godscroft's panegyric is how closely it follows the Greek pattern in length (160 lines), tone and form but with the poet assuming the persona of Scotland and addressing the king as such, a technique later adopted by Lithgow in 1633 in his 'Scotland's Welcome to her Native Sonne and Soveraign Lord King Charles'. At the same time Scotland is personified as the king's mother 'matri dilectus' (l. 6) 'dum mater eram' (l. 7) and 'genetrix' (l. 151), rather than as neglected lover as portrayed by Craig and Drummond.

Godscroft, like so many others, makes the point that the visit is long overdue. 'Ergo ades o tande' (l. 1) (so here you are at last) is the greeting, and emphasis is placed on the very long journey, 'tam longum qui emensus iter' (l. 27), the suggestion being of time rather than distance. The greeting, half-scolding, half-rejoicing, is totally appropriate for a mother to her son.

Te flumina nostra  
 Te liquidi fontes et tristi murmure sylvae  
 Et rignae lachrymis valles, nemorosaque montes  
 Culmina Te moestis suspitavere cavernis  
 Tot lustra (ll. 7-11)

(For you our rivers sighed, for you clear fountains  
 and woods with sad murmuring and valleys well watered  
 with tears and wooded mountain peaks sighed for you  
 in mournful caves for so many years)

This extended personification in the form of pathetic fallacy introduces a contrast between past and present: when the king was absent compared with now that he is present, and the same words are repeated 'flumina nostra', 'liquidi fontes', 'sylvae valles', 'nemorosaque montes culmina' but they are now rejoicing: 'laeto carmine' (with joyful song) being contrasted with the 'tristi murmure'. Similarly, the 'moestis cavernis' are replaced by 'ad sydera', from the depths to the heights.

After the scene-setting, reference is made to the king's pedigree, the 106th descendant of Fergus, a feature usual in the classical panegyric but particularly popular at this time with arriviste monarchs like the Tudors; and of course in the British context James was also arriviste. James had commissioned a genealogy from John Johnson<sup>24</sup> and it is to this that Godscroft refers. Similarly, Spenser traced Elizabeth's ancestors in the Faerie Queene.<sup>25</sup> However, Godscroft goes on to emphasise James's descent from Bruce 'fatalis soboles ... nona' (l. 54) (the ninth offspring). But more than this he extends the field and claims multinational descent back to the Jews.

Scoto Anglo Franco et Hiberno

Quaque rigat Tiberis et qua Jordanis  
inundat (ll. 55-56)

(from Scot, English, French and Irish and where the Tiber waters and the Jordan floods)



As if that is not enough, further emphasis is given to the pedigree by claiming the descent of the Stewarts from Banquo and Fleance, outlining the European connections from ancient British, English, Norman, Frank, Danish, Spanish and German kings as well as the house of Douglas and Angus so that James may number as many kings in his pedigree as the surface of the earth holds:

numeresque in stemmate Reges  
Latus quotcunque orbis habet (ll. 81-82)

Just as the panegyric developed from the funeral oration and the accompanying procession of the 'images' so true to the tradition, Godscroft parades James's ancestors. As one would expect, reference is made to current affairs by hinting at James's political role in the European scene: the way James wanted to see himself as universal peacemaker.

Tu qui bello quaterne orbem  
(Armisque animisque potens terraque marique)  
Posses vicinasque ciere in proelia gentes  
Pacis amans, colis aliam et pacis diciet  
author (ll. 99-102)  
(You who could shake the world with war, powerful in arms and courage on land and sea, and could summon neighbouring nations to battles, a lover of peace you cultivate it in bounty and choose to be called the author of peace)

It is somewhat ironic that he should go on to say

ac populos in bella cruenta ruentes  
Germanos Gallosque Italos Batavosque et  
Iberos Compositis froenas odiis (ll. 103-105)  
(and composing hatreds you restrain the peoples rushing into bloody wars, Germans, Gauls, Italians, Batavians and Iberians)



in view of fact that the Thirty Years War, that central European maelstrom, which was to set back most of Europe for half a century and in which all Europe was going to be involved, was going to start the following year. However it is true to say that James had done his best to bring about peace by bringing the war with Spain to an end and by marrying his children into Catholic and Protestant dynasties, although the latter was to some extent to misfire on him.

The climax of this part of the poem is the statement 'arbiter Europae perque Europam Arbiter orbis' (l. 107) (Arbiter of Europe and through Europe Arbiter of the world) which is gross exaggeration and flattery but a beautifully-balanced hexameter.

But for Godscroft the real cause for celebration is the uniting of the two kingdoms. As a Borderer aware of the constant Anglo-Scottish warfare, he rejoices in the fact that James has led so many English into Scotland in peace and he welcomes them.

Tot Caledonis in oras  
Anglorum ducens turmas, pacem tamen una  
Ducis et innocuas das foedere iungere dextras  
(Leading so many squadrons of English onto the shores  
of Scotland you bring peace and at the same time grant  
that lands free from wrongdoing are joined in a treaty  
of peace) (ll. 109-11)

The emphasis is on the joint heritage of Britain: 'communemque patrem' (l. 116), 'communemque Deum' (l. 117), 'communem matrem' (l. 118) in the prophetic utterance of Scotia after which is added the traditional

'absit omen'<sup>26</sup> in this case 'absitque injuria verbis' (l. 120), the equivalent of 'touch wood!' The poem ends with the injunction to live long, be righteous and great, after which it is prophesied that James will reign in heaven 'vere Rex cuncta in saecula Regna' (l. 160) (truly a king forever).

Quite apart from the 'absit omen' there are several instances of following the classical convention: reference to the 'penates' (l. 53) the household gods; telling the English to be 'boni' (l. 115), a term frequently used (meaning morally good men) by Cicero when addressing the optimates; and the use of the weighted last word in the line to give emphasis, e.g. Britannum (ll. 45 and 46).

All in all, it is obvious that Godscroft delights in being Scoto-Britannicus as he often signs himself. But even more significant is the fact that he sees Scotland and Britain in a European context which is appropriate for a humanist, Christian and historian. He sees Scotland as a significant part of a much wider canvas.<sup>27</sup>

But panegyric was not the sole preserve of the monarch. It was common to use the panegyric style to extol the virtues of any prominent person. Buchanan thus eulogised Henri II of France and Henry VIII of England. Barclay treated Christian of Denmark and Robert Cecil similarly, as did Andrew Melville writing about Scaliger and Buchanan and Maitland writing about Tycho Brahae and

Philip Sidney.<sup>28</sup> Obviously people in a position of power like Henri II or the objects of genuine admiration such as Scaliger were likely subjects and one feels that the poet must always have had at the back of his mind the possibility of patronage. Therefore the choice of subject says much about the poet. As one would expect, there are in the corpus of Godscroft's poetry poems addressed to members of the Hume and Douglas families, also poems to Robert Rollock, Andrew Melville and Chancellor Maitland and his wife, the Scottish intelligentsia, but also to Francis Walsingham, Robert Cecil and Queen Elizabeth, thus making it clear where Godscroft's political and religious sympathies lay. It is noticeable that in a collection of about a hundred poems there is none to Mary, not even an epitaph, whereas Elizabeth gets both.

The two poems addressed to Walsingham, although apostrophising him as worshipper of the Muses and lover of true piety, are relatively restrained and the emphasis has changed from advice to prayer.

Quid tibi te et tanta dignum pietate precemur (l. 3)  
(what shall we pray for you worthy of you and such piety?)

Wealth and honour are unimportant for such a man.

Sunt animo tamen haec inferiora tuo (l. 8)  
(Such things are inferior to your mind)

What is important to him is his care of the Muses and piety which the poet prays will remain with him to the end of his days 'seros et perstet in annos' (l. 13). Just as Walsingham is a refuge for the fugitive so may God protect him. This obviously refers to Walsingham's role in providing assistance and refuge for the exiled Protestant lords in England when they and Godscroft were looked after by Walsingham's son-in-law Philip Sidney. The line 'Praesidium, portus dulce patrocinium' (l. 2, l. 16) (refuge, haven and sweet protection), is used twice in the twenty-line poem in relation to Walsingham and his role but a third time in relation to God, whose divine power is a greater refuge, haven and protection (l. 20). There is, of course, added meaning in the use of the word 'patrocinium' which can mean 'protection' or 'patronage', a word closely associated with Walsingham who ruined himself in this connection with his son-in-law.

The second poem addressed to Walsingham emphasises the word 'religio'. Instead of piety it is true religion that is his main concern and of course refers to his Protestant sympathies. But the poem which comprises only twelve lines is really an exercise in the use of the word 'religio' in seven of these lines, and so true religion rather than Walsingham is the theme of the poem which ends with a profession by the poet

Saevaque mors potius properatos finiat annos  
 Quam non sincera religione fruar (ll. 11-12)  
 (Rather may savage death finish the hastening years  
 than I not enjoy true religion)

The poem addressed to Queen Elizabeth, however, is so excessive and adulatory as to be positively distasteful to the modern reader. It was written presumably in the flattering style appropriate for the English court and guaranteed to appeal to Elizabeth. It is not known if Elizabeth was presented with it during the sojourn of the exiled Lords but most likely the purpose was to win favour at the English court and for Godscroft to have his poetic talent recognised.

The poem adopts the customary allegorical conventions likening Elizabeth to Venus and being mistaken for Venus by Mars:

Nuper belligeros Mavors cum viseret Anglo  
 Vidit te et venerem credidit euse suam  
 Ibat in amplexus iamque oscula nota ferebat  
 At tibi virginens venit in ora pudor. (ll. 1-4)  
 (When lately Mars the warlike English viewed,  
 he saw you and believed you were his love. He  
 went to embrace you, offered you the familiar  
 kisses, but maidenly modesty came on your lips)

But then Mars discovers how clever and virtuous she is, so she must be Minerva and so figurative language combines with flattery but at the same time produces high sounding poetry, for example

Sed cur doctiloquae volitant circum ora  
 camoenae (l. 11)  
 (Why do the Muses with their learned tongues flit  
 round your lips?)

Thus far the references are in the form of classical allegory but then Godscroft goes on to enumerate the qualities of Elizabeth that are most highly praised - 'virtus' (virtue), 'pudicitiae' (modesty) and 'certe

sexu prudentia maior' (wisdom greater than the rest of her sex), a remark which shows the poet's difficulty in combining regal qualities with the fact that she is a woman. And so he goes on to highlight her physical attributes in a way that would appeal to Elizabeth the woman.

hilaesque oculi, vultusque serenus  
 Pectora albenti candidiora nive  
 Me facies supra humanum formosa fefellit  
 Me teretes digiti, lactaolaeque manus) (ll. 19-22)  
 (the merry eyes, the countenance serene, the face  
 beautiful beyond the human has me deceived,  
 the breasts whiter than purest snow, the  
 slender fingers, hands so milky white)

When one considers that when Godscroft saw Elizabeth she would be in her fifties, an old woman by the standards of the age, this is obvious poetic licence.

Having likened Elizabeth to Venus, then Minerva and finally Juno, Godscroft goes on to give the invocation

ut cunctos vivat mansura per annos  
 Et vincat fatis fata superba suis (ll. 27-28)  
 (May she live enduring through all the years, may  
 she defeat the overweening Fates by her own destiny)

concluding with the prophecy 'eris terris Juno Minerva Venus' (l. 34) (you will be Juno Minerva and Venus on earth). As if that is not enough an Appendix is added:

Quae Venus et Pallas quae maxima numina Juno  
 Praestabant olim singula: sola potes:  
 Non Venus es; non tu Pallas; non maxima Juno  
 Maior Junone es, Palladeque et Venere (ll. 35-38)  
 (The powers divine that Venus Pallas and mighty  
 Juno each showed in far off days, you can achieve  
 unaided on your own: Venus you are not, neither  
 Pallas nor greatest Juno: you are greater still  
 than Juno Pallas Venus one and all)



The staccato phrases 'sola potes: non Venus es: non tu Pallas: non maxima Juno' are in marked contrast to the flow of the previous lines and create dramatic effect, an effect which is heightened by the use of the final statement as a climax after the three preceding negatives, in the style of Ciceronian rhetoric.

The poem, however, is very evocative of Buchanan's address to Elizabeth:

Cuius imago Deae facie cui lucet in una  
 Temperie mixta Juno Minerva Venus(29)  
 (Of which goddess is this a picture, when in  
 one face shines in due mingling Juno, Minerva,  
 Venus?)

Elizabeth also figures in Daphn-Amaryllis. Written in 1604, it is an allegorical celebration of the succession of James to the English throne. In case the allegorical allusions are not understood, Godscroft has included careful notes and explanations, e.g. Daphn refers to James, Amaryllis to Elizabeth and of course the title indicates the union of the Crowns. Terms such as 'pastores' are explained as the Magnates and Council and Godscroft even includes the derivation of certain words such as 'ovifer' which shows his knowledge of Hebrew, and 'marmor' is given the special meaning it has for the author: what he had read and remembered as a boy reading Major's history. He even quotes from Major:

Ni fallent fatum Scoti quocumque locatum  
 Invenient lapidem regnare tenentur ibidem  
 (If the Scots do not mistake their destiny they  
 will be held to reign in that same place where  
 they will find the stone located)

Referring to the stone of Scone, he states that once upon a time it was destined for the inauguration of the Kings of Scots, until carried to London by Edward, an episode which figures largely in Godscroft's own Histories and excites comment from him. James being crowned on it, he says, shows the strength of this statement.

Daphn-Amaryllis is divided into four Eclogues and is written in the form of a masque with dialogues and chorus. But the outstanding feature of the work is the clever way Godscroft uses the last word or syllable of each line to provide a comment in the way of a Greek chorus which he calls Echo since it is in fact a repetition.

Si tempna vivat                                /vivat  
Plena satis Daphnis iam Pan pascina regnet /regnet  
Arma Pales nurusus.  
(If Daphnis lives long enough then Pan will rule over  
the flocks and Pales will rule over the herds again)

The Echo provides variously a commentary, epitaph for the Queen or hymn of praise for James. Although one cannot but admire the cleverness exhibited, at times one feels it puts undue strain on the poetry and the sentence construction, for example:

dum fronde cape, dum per inga gramen/amen  
Pascentur tanri aut alta ad bumalia stramen /amen  
(While the goat will feed on foliage and the  
bulls graze the grass on the hills)

'Pascentur' is followed in the first clause by the ablative case 'fronde' and in the second by an accusative 'gramen' where one would expect 'gramine'.

Godscroft, however, is at ease with the pastoral theme and setting which is not surprising in view of his life as the younger brother of a Border laird, familiar with the countryside and its pursuits. But it was not just appropriate for him; it was a prominent feature of European writing in the second half of the sixteenth century.<sup>30</sup>

Said to have started with Theocritus's contrast between life in the Sicilian hills and that of Alexandria, the fiction of an age of simplicity was created among the Augustan writers and the association of the ideal world with pastoral life was effected by Virgil, and with it a 'golden age', which is repeatedly referred to in Godscroft's poetry about James and the Union of the Crowns. It was, however, Sannazaro's Arcadia<sup>31</sup> which was to influence the poets of the Pleiade, most notably Ronsard whose Mignonne allons voir si la rose (1553) and Belleau's Bergerie (1566) became immediately famous. It is to be remembered that Buchanan associated with that group<sup>32</sup> and that Ronsard was a particular favourite of Mary Queen of Scots<sup>33</sup> and so Scotland was very much a part of the European literary scene even to the extent of leading the way as far as England was concerned. Buchanan's scholarship, European reputation and position as tutor of the young James made him an example to be copied in England as well,<sup>34</sup> where without doubt the Sidney circle was to influence English

composition along the same lines. After all Sidney was to highlight Buchanan in his Defense of Poesie<sup>35</sup> and was himself an exponent of the pastoral, which was typified by his Arcadia and Philisides and was to reach new heights with significant works such as Shakespeare's As You Like It and Milton's Comus. The common feature of all these works is a rustic setting, the inter-relation of shepherds and shepherdesses and the predictable if not monotonous intervention of deities such as Phoebus, Diana, Cupid and Pan, sometimes with allegorical significance as in the case of Daphn-Amaryllis or Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar but more often without as in Sidney's Arcadia or Shakespeare's As You Like It. And so one finds particularly with Daphn-Amaryllis, Godscroft is drawing on his vast knowledge of classical authors, in particular Virgil's *Georgics*, and at the same time showing his familiarity with contemporary literature and conventions.

The poems, however, which show the extent of Godscroft's classical awareness and thorough knowledge of Latin verse composition are the *Elegies*. Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid all followed in the footsteps of Gallus whose 'Amores' spawned the Latin love elegy. By definition the love elegy draws on many sources: lyric, epigram, pastoral, is coloured throughout with illustrations drawn from Greek mythology and strongly influenced by the schools of rhetoric. In every respect

Godscroft's elegies meet this definition. The elegies to Andrew Simpson, the celebrated teacher at Dunbar Grammar School, are very appropriately a tribute to him and the thoroughness of his teaching. Crammed full of classical allusions and having the somewhat uninspiring theme of the folly of love, they contain nonetheless some glorious descriptions and one is aware of some 'mighty lines', the poetry of which transcends the language. But one has to work hard to reach the nuggets if one has not been educated in the same tradition to the same extent.

The beginning of the first elegy sets the tone: the difficulty of getting down to composition -

Horret equus stimulos, stricta asque recusat  
habenas (l. 1)

(The horse shudders at the goads and the ass  
constrained baulks at the reins)

After further analogies of bullocks coming to the yoke and the heavy spear being taken in an unwilling hand, he admits:

Ipse ego Apollineas artes, durumque laborem  
Nam labor est, quondam qui mihi busus erat

Horreo (ll. 11-13)  
(I myself shudder at Apollo's arts and the hard toil,  
for it is toil which once was play to me)

and we know that what follows was by no means effortless:

et facta est chartis quanta litura meis (l. 16)  
(how great the erasure in my papers); and

Et pudet et falear, paene haec luctantia frustra  
Conor in invitos cogere verba pedes (ll. 23-24)  
(It shames me and I confess it, almost in vain I



try to force these struggling words into unwilling feet)

These are the remarks of an old person aware of failing faculties but the pathos lies in his realisation that he has not fulfilled his early promise. Metaphors and personification abound, but lines such as

tristis hyemo pulso captivat corda calore (l. 41)  
(sad winter has cast out warmth and holds the heart a captive)

demonstrate Godscroft's feeling for language and poetic sensitivity. He sees himself as having turned into rock and the analogies he makes with Actaeon<sup>36</sup> sprouting horns and Philemon's limbs<sup>37</sup> becoming bark are straight from Ovid. It should, however, be noted that although these elegies give the impression of having been written at the end of Godscroft's life, he was to live another twenty-five years after their publication, proof of the true poetic skill in conveying real or imaginary sentiment.

'Elegy' 1 is largely autobiographical, concentrating on the poet's childhood, his relationship with his teacher, and the poetic ability which he then had. He tells that he had an aptitude for verse composition as a schoolboy although he states he never reached the heights but 'tenera carpsi vaccinia dextra' (I plucked the blaeberries with a light hand (l. 91) on the lower slopes', a line evocative of Milton's 'Lycidas'). The extended metaphor at this point gives a delightful pastoral picture of meadows full of colour and beauty: while lilies, dark red roses, soft violets, purple



hyacinth and marigolds glowing red and yellow, a description worthy of Virgil. At the same time a very clear picture of the schoolmaster emerges, very similar to the Orbilius Plagosus<sup>38</sup> of Horace's youth, with repeated reference to the wielding of the cane:

Saepe tibi cum frons nebulis horresceret atris  
 Et quateret rigidae lenta flagella manus  
 Illa tibi nebulasque atras excussit et iras  
 Torsit et a rigida lenta flagella manu (ll. 113-116)  
 (When often your brow was bristling with black clouds  
 and the rod quivering in your stern hand, it (his  
 verse) chased away the black clouds of anger and  
 twisted the rod from your stern hand)

The emphasis on the importance of the rod is shown by repetition of the words 'rigida lenta flagella manus' almost exactly two lines later, and the words 'et quateret' becoming 'torsit et' to emphasise the difference.

This episode is reminiscent of Buchanan's description of the trials of being a schoolmaster and the later picture of the schoolmaster in Goldsmith's 'The Deserted Village'. If the ensuing verse is no good it is not his teacher's fault - 'non tua sed culpa est fatear, mea' (l. 153): (not your fault, I will confess, but mine) but if there is any glory to be had, it is his teacher's - 'quanta est gloria tua est' (l. 156): (whatever the glory, it is all yours). It is interesting to note as proof of his ability that he was not just the hope of his teacher but also of Buchanan - 'huc tua spes huc Buchanani praesagia magni' (l. 14): (thus for your hope

and the prophecy of the great Buchahan). But he goes on to say it profited him nothing to have pleased so great a man, and here one detects a note of bitterness that in an age of place and patronage his talent did not get the treatment it deserved. The first Elegy acts as introduction. In the ensuing Elegies, Godscroft adopts the conventions of the classic love elegy so much a feature of classical Latin poetry.

The second elegy describes how, despite the various attempts of Cupid, the poet has remained immune to love, protected by Diana. The whole poem is the campaign on the part of Cupid to ensnare him and there are extended descriptions of the hunt, both as undertaken by himself on the one hand and as undertaken by Cupid on the other: ..

Saepe suas posint pedicas et retia frustra Et frustra  
insidias saepe tetendit amor (ll. 17-18)

(Often he placed his nets and traps in vain, and in  
vain love often laid its ambush).

Repetition emphasises the words 'saepe' and 'frustra' and the description of the hunting of the deer is given immediacy by the repetition of 'et modo'. However the tactics adopted by Cupid in desperation setting traps entwined with hooks - 'retibus implicit hamos' (l. 27) and smearing his darts with deadly poison - 'litifero spicula felli linit' (l. 82) makes the reader realise he cannot possibly escape, rather as Claudius and Laertes

plot the death of Hamlet,<sup>39</sup> the end is inevitable. There is a wonderful description of Cupid stalking the poet

Haeret et in tergo sedulus usque meo  
 Aut lateri graditur comes insidiosus: inerme  
 Si qua meum forsan praebeat hora latus (ll. 84-86)  
 (He clings sedulously to my back or as a treacherous  
 companion comes up to my side: in case at some point  
 in time my unarmed side should present)

It is thus with a feeling of anticipation and expectation that the reader is prepared for the third elegy which provides the climax.

The scene is set, in territory well known to the poet, a hill where the Dee and Whitadder meet, and again one is made aware of Godscroft's knowledge of the countryside and its flora and fauna. He is not just observing the pastoral convention. As soon as the sparrowhawk drives the birds from cover the present tense is used to convey the drama, immediacy and confusion of the hunt, e.g. 'salit', 'ruunt', 'adsum', 'rogo'. The description of the dogs could have been made only by someone well accustomed to hunting:

Illas per dumos rostris et mare sapaci Turba inimica;  
 inhiaus, prensat anhela, canum (ll. 15-16)  
 (Through the brambles, with muzzles and sensitive nose  
 the hostile pack, mouth agape, panting, grabs them)

The division of the line into four imitates the staccato effect of panting and speeds up the action. And descriptive phrases usually no more than a couple of words, e.g. 'pede suspenso' and 'aures arrecta' (ll. 21-22) paint an immediate picture.

However, the poet did not realise that what he was chasing was in fact Cupid in disguise, and he was being led by him to meet 'illa Caledonias inter pulcherrima nymphas' (l. 49) (the most beautiful girl in Caledonia). After a lengthy description of her beauty the poet states that while he was admiring her Cupid dropped his bird disguise and fired his arrows, delivering 'vulnera mille' (l. 98) (a thousand wounds). But because the poet has resisted Cupid so long Cupid punishes him by firing a leaden arrow at the maiden so that she will not return his love. The tension is sustained by interposing a long speech from Cupid before the firing of the lead-tipped arrow.

This is followed by a lengthy vilification of Cupid and the agonies of unrequited love during which Godscroft makes comparison with all the worst punishments known to the ancient world. Such pain is more savage than the tortures of the Furies, the Etna pyre, the thirst of Tantalus, the Sisyphean rock and the bonds of Prometheus - a comprehensive list of classical allusion written in a highly rhetorical style. The elegy ends with the warning:

Suspirat qui modo, risit here (l. 192): (he who  
now sighs laughed yesterday)

since love is as fickle as fortune:

Neon minus instabilis vaga quam fortuna Cupido (l.  
195)

The fourth elegy has as its theme the agonies of the rejected lover, and to make matters worse 'alter habet quod amas' (l. 25): (another has that which you love). The poet further tortures himself with the realisation that this is a mismatch - 'O vinclo coeunt quam dispare' (l. 67): (O how the pair come together with unequal bond), their minds are dissimilar and cannot agree. Whether this refers to a real situation is difficult to say but it is certainly written with compelling conviction. The misery, the tears, the jealousy and the cursing of the lovelorn are all there culminating in his curse - 'mors veniat tardo non properata pede' (l. 46) (let death come not speedily but with a slow foot).

The final elegy begins with a convention common to many poets, the dream. The scene is set observing the classical convention:

Nox erat et Phoebe rosis argentea bigis  
 Scandebat medii culmina celsapoli (ll. 1-2)  
 (It was night and silvery Phoebe in her rosy  
 chariot was climbing to the highest point in the  
 heavens)

The ensuing statement shows complete balance, with the sentence divided into two equal parts but at the same time moving the focus from the general to the specific and keeping the connection by means of the common verb 'habebat'.

Muta quies terras: et me sopor altus habebat (l. 3)  
 (Dumb silence held the earth and deep sleep held me)



In his dream Venus appears accompanied by Cupid, Bacchus and the Dryads. A picture of wantonness is created. Bacchus 'tempora henaens minsto suffusa rubebat' (his temples suffused with wine glowed red) and Venus 'monstrabat cupidis livida colla notis' (l. 38): (showed a neck bruised with marks of love). The purpose of their visit was to get him to submit to Cupid's yoke. How could he hope to resist when mighty Jove succumbed. Venus exhorts him to be like King David:

Esto tibi exemplum Solymae regnator opimae  
Inclytros et cuius tu quoque nomen habes (ll. 89-90)  
(Let the famous ruler of Jerusalem whose name  
you share be an example to you)

But it is not marriage she recommends, rather sweet 'acts of stealth':

Furta tibi placeant; furtis est apta inventus (l. 207)  
(Let acts of stealth be your pleasure; youth is apt  
for acts of stealth)

Repetition is used for emphasis and the line neatly balanced with each half beginning with the same word. The examples of Buchanan and Beza are quoted, who both in their youth gave service to Venus. The poet is convinced and about to succumb, an alluring beauty appearing before him but the light of dawn shows her baseness.

Tum primum patuere artes; fraudesque dolique (l. 263)  
(Then her arts and crafts and tricks were revealed)

He then goes on to describe her in a way that is evocative of Buchanan's revulsion at Leonora<sup>40</sup> and realisation of what he has escaped, which in turn is



evocative of Catullus. Godscroft here is demonstrating his powers of vilification and pejorative writing. The ensuing passage describing the onset of premature old age and all its ailments shows considerable familiarity with medical terms and enough knowledge to create horrid images - 'calculus aut urit renes' (l.277) (the stone burns the kidneys), 'lurida consumit tabida membra lues' (ghastly plague consumes the decaying limbs), 'exhaustique tremunt amissis viribus artus' (l.285) (exhausted limbs tremble with lost strength), 'palpitat effoeto laxa tremore cutis' (l.286) (slack skin throbs with weary trembling). And so the message is the danger of lust which subverts men's minds and prevents them entering the heavenly dwellings and congregations of the righteous - 'coelestesque domos, coetusque intrare piorum', (l.295) lines very evocative of the end of Psalm 1, which leads Godscroft to give the example of David whose psalms are a warning. Similarly Beza, having reformed, is also quoted as an example, and here Godscroft's sympathies are made clear with reference to 'Beza meus' (l.309) (my Beza):

verique            magister            (ll.321-322)  
 Tramitis, ad coeli culmina monstrat iter  
 (Master of the true life he shows the way to the heights of heaven)

It vigil ipse suo Duxque comesque gregi (l. 326)  
 (He goes himself as guardian, leader and companion to his flock)

Quam bene Romani fraudem erroresque Tyranni (ll.327-8)  
 Turbat

(How well he throws in confusion the fraud and error  
of the Roman tyrant)

The injunction to follow his example without delay ties  
in with the current Renaissance theme of 'carpe diem'  
since one does not know how soon death will come.

Mox veniet celeri mors inopina pede (l. 334)  
(Soon death will come with a swift foot, unexpected)

And this philosophy is beautifully expressed in the  
couplet

Pelle moras: nescis roseo quid lucifer ortu (l. 339)  
Quidue rubens sero vespere stella ferat  
(Don't delay: you do not know what dawn may bring at  
its rosy rising or what the blushing star in the early  
evening)

Instead of the usual use of the epicurean philosophy of  
'carpe diem' as an excuse for pleasure seeking and  
indulgence, it is converted to a moral Christian usage  
which typifies so much of Godscroft's writing - the  
combination of humanism with Calvinism. The poem ends  
with the confident statement of the true believer

Ipse manum coelo, Dominus protendit ab alto  
Et vocat in magni flammae templa poli  
Ipse aderit, natusque et spiritus: ipse iuvabit  
Sufficiet menti robur et ipse tuae (ll. 341-344)  
(The Lord himself stretches forth his hand from  
on high and calls you to the fiery temples of  
the heavens. He himself will be there and his  
son and the holy spirit. He himself will supply  
strength to your mind)

Throughout the elegies one is confronted with  
Godscroft's in-depth knowledge of the classics and Greek  
mythology and in particular his familiarity with Virgil  
and Ovid. Quite apart from the obvious use of Apollo,  
Diana, Cupid, Phoebus, Pallas and Jove (which is to be  
expected, given the theme), and the detailed knowledge of

their relationships to one another and to others, the geography of the ancient world is just as well known to the poet: Riphean cold, the Castalian fountain, Aeaea Circe's island, Aganippaeae the fountain of Helicon, Grynna and the gold-bearing Pactolus, not to mention Styx, Phlegeton and Acheron. The verse is redolent of Ovid with references to Acteon, Philemon and Baucis Nisus Prometheus, Sisyphus, Tantalus, Eucladus, Hero and Leander. But he merely alludes to them assuming their fates to be known to the reader. Even so, many expressions are echoes of Virgil and Ovid as well as other classical authors: 'ferre iugi',<sup>41</sup> 'scabra rubigine ferrum',<sup>42</sup> 'datur hora',<sup>43</sup> 'clarior pocula',<sup>44</sup> 'arundine carmen',<sup>45</sup> 'uluiasset canem',<sup>46</sup> 'iuga Pindi',<sup>47</sup> 'gleba uber',<sup>48</sup> 'gelido uber',<sup>49</sup> and 'Pegasides undas',<sup>50</sup> are just some examples from Virgil, Ovid, Cicero and Tremellius. Metaphors, similes and personification abound: his poetic talent he describes as a gold-bearing river, eyes are likened to twin stars flashing in the heavens, sleep is personified as cherishing the earth with its embrace, and hyperbole is used extensively, e.g. 'Pelion seemed to be laid on my shoulders'. The wealth of figures of speech enhance meaning, give colour, clarity and richness of texture, all within the constraints of the elegaic couplet of which Godscroft is the complete master.

The Psalmist David is mentioned in the last elegy but not surprisingly the Psalms figure significantly in Godscroft's poetic composition. The religious value of the Psalms is self-evident and throughout the centuries they have been seen as 'the cornerstone of Christian piety'.<sup>51</sup> So significant were they that Jerome made three Latin translations: the Roman based on the Septuagint, the Gallican derived from the Hexaplaric text of the Septuagint and on which the Vulgate is based; and the Hebrew taken from the Hebrew text but less well-known. From earliest times the book had been a source of spiritual comfort and inspiration, covering as it does such a vast range of moods and messages. According to the *Biblia Sacra* 'the Holy Ghost composed the Psalms for our comfort in our state of sin and prescribed them for our use and benefit'.<sup>52</sup> And just as Virgil was believed to predict the birth of Christ, so the saints found in the Psalms the anticipation of Christ's teaching. In the ensuing centuries the Psalms were to feature largely in the theological writings of Augustine, Xavier, Luther, Calvin and Beza and their ideological as well as spiritual importance was recognised. It is therefore not surprising that Godscroft should refer to the Psalmist and the Psalms themselves even stating in his family history that his father used to quote his favourite Psalm 146.

But the Psalms came to occupy a special position in the development of Renaissance literature.<sup>53</sup> It was Petrarch who led the way in reasserting the poetical character of the Psalms, and the humanists emphasised the Greek importance of music and its moral power as indicated by Plato and Aristotle, to be later expressed by Hooker thus 'the very Harmony of sounds being framed in due sort and carried from the ear to the spiritual faculties of our Souls is by a native puissance and efficacy greatly available'.<sup>54</sup> Commentaries, translations and paraphrases of the Psalms were to be a feature of sixteenth-century writing: Marot in France, Aretino in Italy as well as Scipio Gentili, Buchanan and James VI in Scotland and Sir Thomas Wyatt and the earl of Surrey in England. Even the young Elizabeth made a version of fourteen Psalms and Sir Philip Sidney was translating the Psalms in the battle camp at Zutphen, a work which his sister Mary Herbert continued after his death. Middleton completed his Welsh translation of the Psalms in the West Indies.

It obviously behoved any serious scholar and devout Christian to involve himself in the Psalms and produce paraphrase comment or translation. Since the Psalms were widely considered to have been composed by David through the direct inspiration of God, paraphrasing or translating them was seen as an act of faith and devotion. But at the same time there was the prevalent



notion that by adapting the Psalms to classical metres they would thus be set on the same level as literature with the masterpieces of Greece and Rome<sup>55</sup> - 'the marriage of Christianity and Humanism'.

It is almost certain that Godscroft did not treat the Psalms as a subject for theological study or was trying to find the underlying meaning. For that he would have had to have consulted the Hebrew Massoretic text rather than the Septuagint, and although there is evidence that he was to some extent familiar with Hebrew, the fact that his numbering of the Psalms coincides with that of the Vulgate and Great Bible would suggest his main concern was rendering them into Latin verse and it was as an act of faith and devotion that the paraphrases were made. The same can be said for the majority of poets of the time.

Of considerable interest, however, is Godscroft's choice of Psalms: two versions of Psalm 1, Psalm 88, Psalm 104 and Psalm 144. The two versions of Psalm 1 were presumably made because this was the psalm which meant most to him. It is a statement of the righteous life. It sums up the faith in God's righteousness and the ideal of piety, and teaches the reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked which may be seen as central to the teaching of the Old Testament. But there is little to choose between the two versions in terms of poetry. They are both written in the same



metre and are two versions of the same message. The only difference lies in the choice of expression. The tone of the first version is more direct and the language plainer and it bears a resemblance to Buchanan's version of Psalm 1:

Felix ille animi, quem non de tramite recto  
 Impia sacrilegae flexit contagio turba (ll. 1-2)  
 (Happy in mind is he whom the sinful contagion of the  
 sacrilegious mob has not turned from the straight  
 path)

Godscroft's first version is:

Felix ille animum cui non per devia flexit  
 Tramite transverso improbitas (ll. 1-2)  
 (Happy is he whose mind wickedness has not bent or  
 turned astray by a crosswise path)

The structure of the second version is more convoluted and gets away from the vocabulary used by Buchanan. An important difference is in emphasis: the analogy of the tree is given more emphasis in the first version, in the second it is more condensed. On the other hand the treatment of the righteous is expressed in one line in version one:

Quippe Deus cui conatus, cui vota secundat (l. 19)  
 (Assuredly God favours his struggles and his prayers)

whereas it is dwelt on in the second version:

Talem illum coelique, solique insignit honore  
 Spes et vota ultra deter Deus: aethere ab alto  
 Successum aspirans facilem et consulta secundat  
 (ll.19-21)  
 (A propitious God marks such a man with the honour of  
 heaven and earth beyond his hopes and prayers:  
 assisting from high heaven, favouring his success and  
 prospering his designs)

This is very reminiscent of the end of Elegy V but more than that; this part of the psalm contains the essence of Calvinist thinking and far from being just a poetic utterance takes the psalm from the Old Testament into the forefront of Calvinist thinking. This is what Godscroft is emphasising and almost certainly why he wrote a second version of it.

Psalm 88 is perhaps a surprising choice: it is the utterance of one who suffers unmitigated anguish, who cleaves to God most passionately when God seems to have withdrawn himself most completely. It is an individual lament, the result of long suffering. There is no expression of hope and it is the bleakest of all the psalms. One can only suppose that the writing of it coincided with a particularly black period in his life, certainly before 1604 when it was published, or else he wrote it as a particular kind of poetic exercise. 'Acer' sums it up. Much more understandable is his choice of Psalm 104, a hymn of praise to God the creator of the universe. The references to the various creatures, mountains, rivers and trees are reminiscent of Godscroft's elegies and pastoral writing and similarly evocative of Virgil and Ovid. This psalm more than the others emphasises the elevation of the psalms in literary terms to the level of the classics and the deliberate use

of expressions such as 'pinguique ... oliva' (p.42) from the *Metamorphoses* and 'spumat vindemia nurstum' from the *Georgics* underline this.

Psalm 144 is also a hymn of praise beginning on an individual and ending on a universal note, since the psalm ends with a prayer for national well-being. The last lines of the psalm are in many respects an echo of the line of Psalm 1.

Foelices quibus ille Deum se praebet: et ille  
(ll.74-75)

Sancta Iovae castis venerantur numina votis

(Happy are those to whom he shows himself as God and they venerate with chaste prayers the sacred divinity of Jove/Jehovah)

The use of 'Jovae' in particular shows the marriage of Christianity and Humanism and the continuity: the grafting of Christian on to pre-Christian belief. There is no doubt that the writing of such poetry was not just an exercise in Latin verse composition: it was an act of faith and shows most clearly the union of the two creeds which directed Godscroft's thinking.

All the above poetry was written for publication and in fact published in 1605. The poems written towards the end of his life were not published until 1639, when his son James produced the 'Poemata Omnia'. The main difference in the later poems is that they are much more personal and were probably not intended for publication. They show Godscroft as a caring family man. From the Wedderburn history it is obvious that family meant much

to Godscroft and he was intensely proud of his ancestors but the poems about his brother, wife and son show him to be just as concerned about them.

The poem written after his brother's death in 1616 contains much of the ancestral pride but there is also an element of bitterness and the politics of the day are incorporated. The poem is an epigram written in the first person as if George is speaking. The emphasis is on his love of the presbyterian church.

Vivo prima Sion, moriente maxima cura (l.1)  
(Alive Sion was his first care, dying it was his greatest)

The church is personified as a beautiful girl formerly 'praelata omnibus puellis' but now like a Cinderella:

In sorde in squalore, irrisa ac sprita ... famila  
(l.7)  
(In dirt and squalor mocked and spurned, a serving maid)

Footnotes to this poem refer to the oppression of the church's liberty by the bishops and reference is made to the parliament of 1606 which confirmed the authority of the bishops and in which parliament a protestation was produced, which is referred to in footnotes and the text. Reference is made to his wardenship of the eastern Marches and how hard he worked for peace as well as the fact that he rejoices in being a Scoto-Briton. Addressing the king, he states his prayers that the union should be everlasting - 'seros teneant ea vincla nepotes' (l. 21) (may these bonds hold your descendants).

Most important is the reference to the wrongful charge of peculation made against him when he was controller of the royal household.

Innocuus, nocui poenas fero; damnaque praesto (ll.50-52)  
 Publica privatis nummis, et praedia vendo  
 Ipse mea et quod nec credor peccasse rependo  
 (Innocent I bear the punishment of the guilty and I sustain public expense out of my private purse and I myself sell my estates and pay back in full what I am believed to have misappropriated)

This fact is obviously significant in explaining the subsequent impoverishment of the family and is of a piece with James's fiscal policy. It is interesting to note, however, that the king is not blamed, rather it is the court which he describes as never fair to good men - 'aula haud equa bonis usquam'. (l. 46) He ends with an injunction to his son:

Aude animum in vera virtutes ducere et ipsam  
 Imprimis pietatem  
 (Dare to lead your mind towards true virtues and above all piety itself)

As in the Histories, the emphasis is on virtue and piety. This was the burden of the message that was repeated over and over again to the nephew for whom Godscroft wrote the family history and so it is likely that this poem too was intended for him. He could have been left in no doubt about its purpose.

Godscroft wrote several poems addressed to his wife Barbara after her death. Here one gets a lasting impression of a strong and devoted love combined with an expression of faith. In the poem which begins 'Non ego



te', he explains what a devoted daughter, wife and mother she was, and how she obeyed her father to the extent of waiting fourteen years before she married Godscroft.

Longus iunxit amor decimum dilatus in annum ll. 6-7)

Et quertum: den ter denos duravit in annos

Et sex

(Love long joined though postponed for fourteen years then lasted thirty six)

What he stresses is her piety and filial duty - 'Inque Deum pietas et amor sacer inque parentem' (l. 12). But throughout the poem there are little touches that show the deep love he had for her, a love that was 'tanto suavissimus aevo' (sweetest in old age); for example he states

Barbara dulce mihi semper, semperque futurum (ll. 4-5)

Dulce mihi nomen

(Barbara a name always sweet to me, which always will be sweet)

Quite apart from the sentiment it is a beautifully balanced statement, simply but beautifully expressed.

In another poem beginning 'Foelix matri pia', there is even greater balance as he sings the praises of his wife and his mother, each statement being divided to show comparison:

Omnibus illa olim placuit; placet omnibus ista (l. 3)

(The one pleased everybody formerly; the other pleases everybody now)



If it seems rather odd that the poet should be comparing his wife with his mother, it is explained by the fact that his wife was his maternal cousin and so he is really singing the praises of the house of Elphinstone, summed up in the last line:

Ecqua domus tales protulit una duas (l. 14)  
(Has any house brought forth such a pair?)

The intense classicism and elevated style of Godscroft's earlier poetry is absent from these later poems. The nearest he comes to it is in the poem beginning 'Si mihi fas' when he states that were it not for the fact they were both accustomed to worshipping one God he would set up altars to her:

locabo (ll. 1-2)  
Te divas inter, dilecta et templa dicabo  
(I shall place you among the goddesses and dedicate temples to you)

This is followed by a lengthy hyperbole, reminiscent of the funeral scene in Hamlet when Hamlet and Laertes compete with each other in extravagant terms to show the extent of their grief:

replebo (ll. 8-10)  
Terrae orbem lachrymis, singultibus aera: planctu  
Findam saxa, fero iuvat indulgere dolori  
(I shall fill the circle of the earth with my tears  
and the air with my sobs, I shall split the rocks with  
my wailing)

This fulsome exaggeration conforms to the conventional expression of grief but much more appealing is the reference to himself as a body only half alive without itself - 'semianimum sine se corpus'. (l. 24)

Perhaps the most moving line of all is in the poem which begins 'Postquam extrema':

Non terra, nec aer (ll. 11-12)  
Non ux iam sine te placet  
(Not earth nor air nor light pleases me now without you)

The theme is that whatever God sends that is sweet will be less so because she is not there to share it. But above all this poem is a confession of faith evocative of the Biblical line<sup>56</sup> 'though he slay me yet will I trust in him', as Godscroft invites God to smite him:

preme, punge et sterne et protere pessum  
Da pedibus tergumque feri, pectusque caputque  
Stringe ensem, atque altum attollas ingloque reconde  
(ll. 53-55)  
(Crush me, pierce me, lay me low and trample me underfoot, strike my back, breast and head, draw the sword, lift it high and bury it in my throat)

But all this cannot destroy his faith

Confidam tamen et supplex venerabor agamque  
Clementi grates (ll. 57-58)  
(Yet shall I trust and as a suppliant I shall worship you and give thanks for your clemency)

The same can be said of the poem beginning 'Mene fugis mea'. He addresses his wife as his own sweet love - 'dulcis amor' - and

O anima et vitae maxima causa meae (l. 2)  
(My soul and greatest reason for living)

But at the same time the emphasis is on their joint religious piety:

Quis meritos mecum Jehovahae mactabit honores (ll. 5-6)  
Atque meo mecum vota precesque Deo?  
(Who will sacrifice with me to God and with me offer vows and prayers to God)

When writing about his eldest son Aselcanus there is the feeling of deep love, whether describing him as a baby or writing about him after he died. The description of the baby in his cradle has the attention to detail of a keen observer. Only someone who has spent time watching a baby could produce such a picture: 'nunc parvis farcina cunis vagit' (he now squalls, a bundle in a wee cradle) (l.5) and watches his mother - 'eam ambit eam aspicit unam' (he solicits her and has eyes for her alone) (l. 8). The language is simple and straightforward, appropriate for the subject, with the absence of imagery.

As with the death of his wife, so with the death of his son there is the utterance of deep sorrow and love.

Chare puer matrique patrique et vincula amoris  
(ll. 1-2)

Pignoraque et magni munera magna Dei  
(Dear boy, the bond and pledge of love for mother and father and the great gift of Almighty God)

The body of the poem is a statement of faith in God culminating in the balanced, divided sentence

Quod facit ille feram: quod volet ille velim (l. 9)  
(What he does I shall bear; what he will wish let me wish)

Since he lost both wife and son at the same time he must certainly have known the meaning of suffering but, instead of complaining, he sees it as God's will which presumably makes it more acceptable. These family poems, as well as giving an insight into the family of the poet and his feelings, also provide very positive

statements of faith. It is as if he has emerged from his humanism and Calvinism predominates and the language and style of his poetry is adapted accordingly. Where his earliest poetry was entirely classical and humanist in sentiment, and his middle poetry combined humanism and Calvinism, his final poetry has moved away almost completely from classicism to become thoroughly Calvinist in outlook.

Godscroft wrote over a hundred poems, ranging from a few lines on the subject of the first of January to lengthy pastoral eclogues. But although the subject varied, mostly he favoured the epigrammatic form of expression and use of the hexameter or elegaic couplet. There is no experimentation with metres and verse forms, which was common amongst other neo-Latin poets of the period. Rather he uses what he is most at ease with and which is appropriate for his subject matter. At times, however, this ease of versification leads to what Byron described as the 'fatal facility',<sup>57</sup> whereby the poet gets carried away with his ease of composition, which tends on occasion to prolixity. His knowledge and use of quantities is flawless, which bespeaks an intrinsic feel for the language as well as being the sign of thorough teaching. But above all he conveys to the reader his claim to be described as 'doctus', a term as highly-valued in the sixteenth century as it was in the first century. An idea of how a classical education was

considered essential may be derived from the description of Shakespeare as 'an upstart crow', who did not have the weight of education to make him accepted by his learned contemporaries. But more than just having the learning, 'the impulse to display is something more openly acknowledged in literature in the Renaissance than in perhaps any other period'<sup>58</sup> which does, of course, lead to writing whose aim is to show above everything else the writer's cleverness. But this was expected and puts Daphn-Amaryllis on a par with the acrostics of the Elizabethan court.

The very concept of the Renaissance was closely linked to a return to poetry<sup>59</sup> and the sixteenth century saw it as an integral part of the Renaissance man's accomplishments. A feature of the century is the number of people who write poems without having any serious literary ambitions.<sup>60</sup> It was part of life and experience but was also recognised as a more elevated form of expression used for taking note of special events. That Godscroft should have had his poetry published in an age when circulation of manuscript copy was still the norm is a token of his ability and reputation.

That his poetry was written in Latin should be no surprise. He was writing for an international audience of educated readers. By writing in English Sidney was excluding most of his humanist friends from readership

and Paradise Lost had to be translated into Latin to be appreciated in Europe.<sup>61</sup> 'A poet thus seemed justified in writing in a language whose future seemed assured by a millenium and a half of pre-eminence'.<sup>62</sup>

Today study of his poetry involves unremitting toil and what has been referred to as 'the specific verbal interface between classical and Renaissance texts'<sup>63</sup> means the reader does not necessarily get all the allusions. But this 'imitatio', the simile or image borrowed from classical writing, was deliberate and a convention used even in the earliest classical texts. It depends, however, on recognition. The writer thus relies on the reader's knowledge and familiarity with the original. Like the use of the Latin itself, which depends on the ways it has been used by previous writers, it is an integral part of the communication. It is thus that Godscroft achieves density of texture and enables the educated sixteenth-century reader, whatever his origin, to tap into the vast body of common knowledge and experience that was the classical heritage.

Godscroft's poetry can be said to be an exemplification of Dryden's lines written as an introduction to a Latin grammar:

nothing is exprest  
Gracefull or true but by the Roman test



To quote a present day poet in the context of MacDiarmid, 'It is wrong to think of a kind of eminence with a wasteland round about'.<sup>64</sup> There is no doubt that Godscroft and many of his contemporaries form the shadow of the eminence of Buchanan but the Delitiae Poetarum Scotorum shows that Scotland, unlike England, was able to compete on terms of equality with France, Italy, Denmark, Belgium, Hungary and Germany in neo Latin poetry. It is significant that at the time Godscroft was writing the new Bodleian Library Catalogue of 1605 contained only 36 English books out of a stock of 6,000.<sup>65</sup>

But among his contemporaries Godscroft deserves special consideration. Apart from the fact that contemporaries like Andrew Melville and the great man himself, George Buchanan, recognised his worth, it is significant that much of his poetry has present-day appeal. The clarity of the imagery, the obvious sincerity and vigour and at times tenderness are of universal appeal apart from the insights he gives into the world he lived in. It is perhaps tedious to be confronted with classical references to such an extent but in this Godscroft is moderate compared with some of his contemporaries. Milton, after all, in his Elegia Prima managed to cram nineteen classical characters into forty-eight lines.<sup>66</sup> But one has to accept this as the

convention of the day, a source of pleasure to the equally erudite reader. And so the shortcomings are on the part of the present-day reader rather than the poet.

## NOTES

## CHAPTER FIVE

1. Patrick Panter to Scot of Scotstarvit, 'I received your Lordship's letter with the verses incloised quill accordinglie I have mended and written over...': Adv MS 17.1.19.
2. Poemata Omnia Lusus Poetici Elegy 1.
3. Adv MS 17.1.19.
4. The History of Scottish Literature, (gen. ed.) R C Craig (Aberdeen, 1988).
5. Ibid., i, 213.
6. J Bannerman, 'The King's Poet', S.H.R., lxviii (1989), 123.
7. W W Greg, Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama (London, 1905) [Greg, Pastoral], 18.
8. OCD 293.
9. R Cummings, 'Drummond's Forth Feasting: A Panegyric for King James in Scotland', The Seventeenth Century, ii (1987), 1-18.
10. James was born in 1566, Godscroft's birth was around 1558.
11. 'Hesiod in Works and Days writes of an ideal golden age in the past comparable to the Garden of Eden. From this period he considered there had been a progressive decline through the silver, bronze and heroic ages until his own time' - Longman's Companion to English Literature (London, 1990), 380.
12. Virgil, Aeneid, 10, 142; Pliny, Historia Naturalis, 5, 29, 30.
13. Pliny, Historia Naturalis, 5, 29, 31; Virgil, Georgics, 2, 137.
14. Livy, Ad Urbe Condita, 1, 33, 9.
15. Ovid, Tristia, 5, 13, 22.
16. Virgil, Aeneid, 1, 417.
17. Ibid., 4, 262.

18. Virgil, Georgics, 1, 7.
19. Horace, Carmina, 2, 17, 7.
20. Virgil, Eclogues, 4, 30.
21. Reference is made to it in Poemata Omnia.
22. Published in the Deliciae Poetarum Scotorum and the Muses Welcome (Edinburgh, 1618).
23. C A Upton, 'National Internationalism: Scottish Literature and the European Audience in the 17th century', S.S.L., xxvi (1991), 220.
24. Contained in the Deliciae Poetarum Scotorum and entitled 'Inscriptiones Historicae Regum Scotorum'.
25. Spenser, Faerie Queene, 11 Canto X.
26. A standard phrase, the longer form of which was 'atque hoc quidem detestabile omen avertat Jupiter' - Cicero, Orationes Philippicae in M Antonium, 11, 5, 11.
27. Williamson, 'Patriot'.
28. Johnston, Deliciae.
29. Buchanan, Epigrams 11; 'Icones' 25.
30. Greg, Pastoral.
31. Ryan, Neo Latin Literature, 201-205.
32. P Ford, George Buchanan, Prince of Poets (Aberdeen, 1982), 2-8.
33. She is said to have sent him a present from prison: Oxford Companion to French Literature (Oxford, 1959), 636.
34. Phillips, 'George Buchanan and the Sidney circle', 72-82.
35. 'Sidney: Defense of Poesie' in Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney, ed. K Duncan-Jones and J A van Dorsten (Oxford, 1973), 110, 116.
36. Ovid, Metamorphoses, 3, 230.
37. Ibid., 8, 631.
38. Horace, Epodes, 2, 1, 70.

39. Shakespeare, Hamlet, Act V.
40. Buchanan, Iambi, 204.
41. Virgil, Aeneid, 3, 542.
42. Ovid, Metamorphoses, 8, 802; Virgil, Georgics, 1, 495; ibid., 2, 220.
43. Cicero, De Familia, 15, 16.
44. Virgil, Aeneid, 3, 60.
45. Ovid, Tristia, 4, 1, 12.
46. Ovid, Metamorphoses, 17, 197; Virgil, Aeneid, 6, 257.
47. Virgil, Ecloques, 10, 11.
48. Virgil, Aeneid, 1, 531.
49. Propertius, Elegies, 2, 2, 5.
50. Ovid, Tristia, 3, 7, 15.
51. ODCR, 1120.
52. Tremellius and Junius, Biblia Sacra, 3f, 105.
53. P. Sidney, Apology for Poetry, ed. Shepherd (London, 1965), 99. J. Buxton, Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance (2nd edn., London, 1964), 152.
54. Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, V, 38.
55. Buxton, Sir Philip Sidney, 152.
56. Job 12, 13.
57. Byron, The Corsair, Introduction.
58. J. W. Binns (ed.), Latin Poetry of English Poets (London, 1974) [Binns, Latin Poetry], Introduction, p. xii.
59. Perosa and Sparros, Renaissance Latin Verse (London, 1979), xxii.
60. New Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse, ed. Jones (Oxford, (1991), Introduction, p. xxxiv.
61. Binns, Latin Poetry, Introduction, p. viii.

62. Ibid.
63. G Braden, The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry (Yale, 1978), XII.
64. Robert Crawford interviewed 19.2.94, The Herald.
65. D Bush, 'English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660', in the Oxford History of English Literature (Oxford, 1962), 33.
66. R. Condee, 'The late Poetry of John Milton' in Binns, Latin Poetry, 60.



## CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

When Andrew Melville wrote to David Hume of Godscroft in 1604 he stated, 'you have such a good mind ... your labours will be rewarded eventually'.<sup>1</sup> Although he never was adequately rewarded in his lifetime, now perhaps his significance will be appreciated. But Melville also wrote, 'You do not canvass the praise of your intellect', and this may in part explain why he has not been accorded the recognition he deserves.

David Hume had the singular advantage of having witnessed and participated in a very significant episode in Scottish history, namely the Ruthven Raid and the fall, first of Lennox, then Arran. He was the link between the two distinct strands of opposition to the Arran regime: the Ruthven Raiders, soon to become the exiled lords, and the religious dissidents, the exiled ministers headed by Andrew Melville. There is no doubt that cross-fertilisation of ideas took place. But whereas the lords on their return either died as in the case of Angus, or resorted to a certain conventionality, Hume continued to fly the presbyterian flag. He more than any other came to be identified as the voice of reason enunciating the sentiments of Melville and Carmichael in a more acceptable form. He was not marked with the stigma of the ministry: he was not a preacher but an intellectual who could counter the cases of Law

and Cowper and draw them into exposing the weaknesses of their arguments. And this he did expertly, using the logic and rhetoric in which he had been schooled in the system which obtained in Scotland in the sixteenth century. Because he was seen to be impartial, able and above all Scottish in his arguments, it could be said that he more than any other non-churchman shaped the presbyterian thinking for time to come. The letters that have come down to us, sadly only too few, have had an audience far beyond that which Hume himself could have anticipated, first because they were in English and secondly because they were seized upon by Calderwood and preserved in an accessible form, despite government-imposed restrictions. He was by no means the only intellectual to engage in the episcopacy controversy - there were indeed many<sup>2</sup> but without doubt Hume of Godscroft made most impact, seen as not having an axe to grind and to this day is identified with the presbyterian argument.

But for Godscroft it was not just a matter of church government. As David Allan has stated<sup>3</sup> the threat to the presbyterian polity he saw as a threat to Scotland itself: to him they were inseparable and parity applied just as much to the one as to the other. Although he was always identified with the pro-English faction as opposed to the pro-French, and was a convinced believer in union with England, in his mind there was never any question of

domination of the one by the other. It is significant that he described himself as 'Scoto Britannus' which is not what it might at first appear, Scottish Briton, rather it is Scot and Briton in equal measure and if precedence were to be accorded it was Scotland first as in the case of Daphn' Amaryllis. Perhaps it was rather naive of him to imagine that Scotland and England could be equal partners in a union where Elizabeth could claim with assurance that the greater would draw the less. This much he had in common with his monarch: the desire for peace between the two countries. As a Borderer he had first-hand knowledge of the problems endemic to the area. After all his father alone and one other ancestor did not die at the hands of the English and the resolution of Border disputes was very much a part of his life. Even in 1617 when it must have been very obvious that parity was increasingly unlikely, he could welcome his monarch not just as the peacemaker in Britain but also in Europe.

The European dimension was fundamental to Godscroft. As a humanist educated in the same tradition and imbued with the same classical heritage as Erasmus and Buchanan, he was in many ways the embodiment of the continuing classical tradition. Through his education and through his considerable expertise in Latin composition he communicated with Europe. Had he written in the vernacular he would have isolated himself and no longer

have been a part of the great European tradition and its common matrix of understanding. The great exception was the History of the House of Douglas and Angus, a work which was of course dictated by that family's requirements but even in it Hume was at pains to show the European alliances, involvements and ramifications of the Douglasses. It is significant that all the books he published in his lifetime were published in quarto size at least, - even the poetry, which normally appeared in pocket size editions. This meant they were intended for libraries, not intended to be carried around. In other words, they were written for posterity.

Like so many of his contemporaries Godscroft found himself in a political system which was at odds with his education. The political philosophies on which he had been reared were directly derived from Aristotle and the problem was resolving his loyalty to his prince with what he had learned about democracy. Of course this was not a problem that was confined to Scotland. One finds, for example, in the writings of Thomas More<sup>4</sup> an awareness of similar contradictions. Like More he remained loyal to his prince to the end of his days but his philosophy is best illustrated in his dialogue with Angus included in the History of the House of Douglas and Angus: a tyrant was totally incompatible with civil liberty and to be shunned at all cost. If it came to it, the tyrant was to be sacrificed in the interests of the body politic. This

was not just humanist thought, however, it was the basis for the arguments propounded by Calvin and Beza and for that matter by Buchanan which were to be used to such effect in 1649. In Godscroft one can see the growth of Calvinism from a humanist stock and how easy it was for the one to develop from the other. And so Godscroft was the purveyor to a wider audience of the continuing European humanism which ended up as Calvinism.

But so aware of the dangers of tyranny was Godscroft that not only did he refer to them as a constant theme in much of his writing but he wrote the Apologia Basilika to guide the new King Charles in 1626. The emphasis here was above all on the virtuous king, who was guided not only by reason and restraint of passion but by virtue. As such, therefore, he had nothing to fear and so would not have to resort to the tactics of Machiavelli's Prince. In this as in all his writings, Godscroft used the examples of history to illustrate the point he was making, examples from classical history which undoubtedly he knew best.

As to be expected in a humanist, great emphasis was placed on the role of history. It was not just 'a treasure house of ancestral good examples',<sup>5</sup> it was the teaching aid par excellence and Godscroft, like the classical writers who were his mentors, considered the purpose of history was to instruct. The History of the House of Douglas and Angus is certainly his best known

work and in it moralising abounds. The reader is left in no doubt regarding the author's attitude in terms of advocacy of virtue and abhorrence of vice, but the History is much more than that. Godscroft had the advantage of living through and participating in much of the action he described in the latter chapters of the History. From that fact alone it is a valuable source. Moreover, it was not a question of writing and remembering years after the event. He was recording events as they happened and the significance of this was appreciated even in 1583 when Carmichael, who was so anxious to obtain the History, put it on a par with the Confession of Faith.<sup>6</sup> But more than this the access that Godscroft had to the records and documents of the family makes it doubly valuable. Recorded in the manuscript are bonds of which no other evidence exists.

It is significant that when James instigated the History of the House of Douglas and Angus it was to Godscroft that the family turned. Admittedly in his youth he had been a trusted servitor, but more important was the fact that he was recognised as an intellectual whose ability was commensurate with such a lofty subject and who would in fact immortalise the family. Godscroft was himself aware of its importance and almost with his last breath urged its publication. Certainly his family knew its worth, not just as a source of history but also containing arguments that were very relevant to the



period of its publication. Unfortunately the exact time of publication was misjudged as it coincided with what looked like a revival in Royalist fortunes. What remains intriguing is the marquis's comment that the printed version was not the 'richt trew coppie'. There is a case for believing that the passages concerning the dialogue between Godscroft and Angus on the subject of the deposition of kings, which are not in the manuscript, were included by one of his family sometime prior to publication. After all, James edited his father's Poemata Omnia and included some of his own work. James was just as presbyterian as his father and would have appreciated the significance of these dialogues and letters. And of course artistically they stand out from the homogeneity of the rest of the work. Be that as it may, we are extremely fortunate to have both the manuscript and printed version.

As a scientific study, there is room for criticism of the History. It contains factual errors, there is inclusion of legend and there is special pleading, but it would be impossible to find a history covering such an expanse of time without errors and as for special pleading, he is the first to admit to partiality. It is an impossibility for a historian to be totally neutral and it is Godscroft's enthusiasm for his subject that is one of the History's attractions.

In his own family history, De Familia Humia Wedderburnensi, the emphasis is similarly on the example and the importance of virtue and once again the role of the traditional loyal nobility is underlined. It is the virtuous noble who is the main support of the virtuous king, one of the checks which preserves civil liberties and prevents the king from becoming a tyrant. Hume stresses the fact that it is the old established nobility and the traditional families that are the essential part of the political framework.

Equally prevalent in both histories is the kin-tie: the bonds of kinship are explained at every opportunity and much is made of them. One is reminded that at the time of writing the bonds of manrent were in the process of disappearing and ties of kinship were being replaced by other considerations. No doubt Godscroft was aware of this and saw its passing with regret. He was in many respects harking back to an age governed by the basic loyalties: loyalty to prince, kin and country summed up in the word virtue. In the family history, however, there is an additional dimension. The detailed account of the life and upbringing of a Border laird gives first hand information that is difficult to match anywhere. Similarly one can derive from it information about the author that would be well nigh impossible to find elsewhere. After all the lives of younger sons are seldom well recorded.

Again it is from Godscroft's poetry that many of the biographical facts about himself and his family are to be gleaned. At its lowest level the poetry is an invaluable historical source. But it is much much more than that. Godscroft's poetry was published before any of his other writings and it was largely as a poet he was known during much of his lifetime. Here again one can see how much he was a poet of the European intellectual scene. His choice of neo-Latin as his medium was obvious: Latin was the language of the classical poets he emulated. He was writing for a readership who did not need a glossary of terms or classical allusions, who were completely at one with him over his choice of echoes and epithets. He was part of that vast international body of knowledge that was part of the classical heritage. But what has been described as the pervasive fondness for tracing the very wording of classical texts more or less directly is absent from Godscroft's work: allusions there are in plenty but the touch is light and the reference blends almost imperceptibly into the context.

It is significant that Godscroft gained the praise of Buchanan and would most likely not have mentioned this fact himself unless it were generally known that he was regarded as Buchanan's heir in terms of Latin poetic composition.<sup>7</sup> Unlike Buchanan he did not experiment with verse forms and rhythms. He remained faithful to the

hexameter and elegiac couplet of which he was the complete master and used them to great effect whatever the subject matter.

In the later poetry although the texture is not so dense one is aware of memorable lines and depth of expression. The poems written about his wife and son show him to have been a devoted husband and father and although love poems are always part of a poet's stock in trade most of such compositions could apply to anyone. This is not the case with Godscroft. His poems are very specific and personal.

It is worth quoting Mungo Dalziel's verses in praise of Godscroft the poet which are included at the end of the Poemata Omnia.

Seaven famous faire imperial townes of Greece  
 For worthie Homere worthilie contended  
 Who whill he lived did interteane their peace  
 Voyde of dissension till his dayis were ended.  
 But when his words gave credit to his worth  
 All challenged the honor of his birth.  
 Pail toylle and travaille did abbrege his dayis  
 Death drowned his cair and eternised his prayse  
 Then greatt Theagira whois majestic style  
 Does overmatch the sweat Maeonian phrase  
 Why does oblivion dark thee all this whyle  
 Obscure thy giftes and spoyle thee of thy praise?  
 ? Phoebus nursing exercise thy vaine  
 Send furth the vertewes of a learned braine  
 Who knowes but some such seaventie townes as these  
 May stryve for thee when ended ar thy dayis

In the nineteenth century, when ability to read Latin was still commonplace Godscroft's poetry was still appreciated and one need look no further than M'Crie's Life of Andrew Melville where he states: 'Few of his

contemporaries show a mind more deeply imbued with the genuine spirit of classical poetry than David Hume. The easy structure of his verse reminds us continually of the ancient models on which it was formed . . . his fancy has a liveliness and buoyancy which prevents the reader from wearying of his longest descriptions'.<sup>8</sup> Sadly the fact that few are prepared to undertake the labour of translation and the pursuit of allusion means that his poetry, like that of his contemporaries who figure in the Deliciae Poetarum Scotorum, is to many a closed book.

Here was a man who more than most encapsulates the period in which he lived and of whom Scotland can be proud. The product of a long line of men of action, he was proud of his heritage and his ability enabled him to take full advantage of the Scottish educational system and become part of humanist Europe. But above all Godscroft proved that it was possible to be national and international at the same time, Scottish and British, humanist and Calvinist, secular and religious. Most important he was loyal - loyal to the values he held dear, to his kin, to his friends, to the reputation of Buchanan, to his prince, to his country and to his religion. But like so many Scots he did not canvass the praise of his intellect and so much of his worth has not been adequately appreciated, either in terms of his literary output or his role in the history of his country.

## NOTES

## CONCLUSION

1. Hume, De Unione Tractatus Secundus, Letter from Andrew Melville, April 1604.
2. The main exponents of what is described as 'the debate over the reformed past in Scotland' are described in Mullan, Episcopacy, 136-150.
3. Allan, Virtue.
4. The Complete Works of St Thomas More, ed. C Muller, L. Bradner and C Lynch (London, 1984), iii, pt. 228-30, Quis Optimus Reipublicae Status.
5. J Durkan, 'The Library of Mary Queen of Scots', in Mary Stewart: Queen in Three Kingdoms, ed. M Lynch (Oxford, 1988), 81.
6. Woodrow Misc., i, 415; CSP Scotland, vii, 195, 208.
7. A H Williamson, 'A Patriot Nobility: Calvinism, Kin Ties and Civic Humanism', SHR, lxxiii (1993), 4.
8. T McCrie, Life of Andrew Melville, (Edinburgh, 1856), 395.



## APPENDIX A

BONDS OF MANRENT AND ALLIANCE  
IN THE HAMILTON MANUSCRIPT

At the end of the manuscript is given a list of bonds, commencing with a reference to the three that are given in the body of the work, i.e. that with James Lord Hamilton; with Lord Fleming of Cumbernauld and the third with John Lord Hamilton and his brother Lord Claud concerning the slaughter of Westraw. And then, infuriatingly, the writer states 'the others for avoiding tediousnesse and yet to give you a view of the many bonds these earles of Angus have besides of noblemen and others of Speciall noate in diverse ages I have only tuched in this ensuing list by naming the due man, the date of the bond and the Earle to whom it was presented and delivered'. Then follows the list 'as namely to the same George 2 was given (besides the former) the bondes of manred for terme of life':-

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1) John Lord Somerville at Tantallon                     | 23 May 1458       |
| 2) James Lindsay provost of Lincluden<br>at Edinburgh    | 11 May 1459       |
| 3) James Scrimgeour constable of Dundee and<br>Edinburgh | 10 October 1456   |
| 4) John Rutherford and eldest son at Haddington          | 12 April 1458     |
| 5) George Turnbull of Bedroule<br>at Galashiels          | 16 April 1456     |
| 6) Richard Bannatine of Corhouse and<br>Galashiels       | 24 September 1456 |

'To all these several seales are appended'.

Then follows the bonds of manred during the lifetime of Archibald Bell the Cat:

- |   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| John Weyms of Stanhardill at Edinburgh    | 23 October 1496 |
| 2) Thomas McDowall of Garflan at Glenluce | 23 January 1494 |
| 3) Hugh Douglas of the Borg at Edinburgh  | 8 October 1483  |
| 4) David Scot of Yerlowe at Edinburgh     | 8 July 1494     |

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 5) John Master of Cathcart knight of Killingham<br>at Edinburgh   | 19 June 149    |
| 6) Sir David Herries of Annandale at Edinburgh  | 4 July 148     |
| 7) Sir Henry Sinclair knight and justiciar of<br>Orkney at Edinburgh  | 10 June 148    |
| 8) Matthew Wallace of Craigie at Irvine   | 14 April 149   |
| 9) Robert Lyle heir apparent to Robert Lord Lyle<br>at Edinburgh<br>'with the exemption of the Lord Kilmarris<br>during his fathers lifetime' | 21 January 149 |
| 10) Sir John Sempil of Cleason<br>at Edinburgh  | 26 January 148 |
| 11) Alex Stuart at Lanark   | 8 May 148      |
| 12) Thomas Kilpatrick of Closburne at Closeburne  | 20 June 148    |
| 13) Mungo Murray of Broughton<br>at Whithorn  | 22 January 149 |

'All these have their several seals appended'

Then there are the bonds during the life of Archibald wh  
married the Queen:

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 1) A bond of Hugh Lord Somerville 'for certain<br>yeares limited at Edinburgh'  | 14 January 152 |
| 2) James Ramsey of Cockpen at Edinburgh   | 19 May 152     |
| 3) amitie and friendship during life from George<br>earl of Rothes at Edinburgh | 17 August 152  |
| 4) William Hamilton of Manwariston at Edinburgh                                 | 12 July 152    |
| 5) Thos Weir of Blackwood at Brockesfield                                       | 2 November 154 |

'All these have their severall seals appended'

There follow the bonds to James earl of Morton and tutor o

Angus:

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| 1) Gill lord Ogilvie at Edinburgh                        | 8 August 156    |
| 2) Bond of James Wood of Bonytoun at Leith               | 22 July 155     |
| 3) Bond of John Ogilvie of Innerwharitie<br>at Edinburgh | 22 July 155     |
| 4) Sir David Graham of Fintrie at Edinburgh              | 10 December 155 |
| 5) John Lovell of Ballumbie at Edinburgh                 | 6 February 155  |
| 6) Thos Fotheringham of Powie at Edinburgh               | 9 December 155  |
| 7) Mr R Auchinleck at Edinburgh                          | 3 December 155  |
| 8) John Balbirnie of Innerightie at Edinburgh            | 2 November 155  |
| 9) Thos Maule of Panmure the younger<br>at Edinburgh     | 19 November 155 |
| 10) John Arbuthnot of Portertowne at Edinburgh           | 155             |
| 11) James Auchterlonie of Kellie at Edinburgh            | 4 February 155  |
| 12) John Lyon of Cassanis at Cassanis                    | 1 September 155 |
| 13) Dan Tyrrie of Drumkilbo at Edinburgh                 | 4 February 155  |

- 14) Alex Ramsey for the liferent of Aldbar at  
Edinburgh 30 April 1558

'All these have their several seals appended'

The bonds of manred to Archibald 'the third of that name' are then listed.

- 1) A general bond of divers of the clanes of East  
Teviotdale signed by 30 severalle persons at  
Jedburgh 20/21 November 1576
- 2) N Rutherford of Hindly and the laird of  
Hunthill taking upon them the burden for the  
whole name of Rutherford at Dalkeith 25 December 1574
- 3) Gilbert Ker of Greenhead and others taking  
upon them the burden for their friends and  
tenants at Jedburgh 22 November 1576
- 4) Thos Turnbull of Bedrule laird of Minto  
Barnchillis Halrowlie and others of the name  
of Turnbull in west Teviotdale at Dalkeith 25 December  
1574
- 5) Stephen Rutherford of Hunthill and others  
Halls Robsons and Ainslies at Edinburgh 23 March 1582
- 6) John Kennedy laird of Blairquhar in assyth-  
ment for the mutilation of George Douglas of  
Wastrie at Stirling 17 May 1578
- 7) William Weir of Slanebyres not to assist  
Sir J Hamilton of Avondale at Lanark 14 December 1580

'All these have seals and subscriptions'

Finally there are the bonds to William, the fourth earl, who died in Paris.

- 1) Andrew Pitcairne of Innerquharitie  
at Edinburgh 10 March 1595
- 2) Wm Bannatine of Carchouse for his manrent  
touching some part of the tithes of Lanark at  
Douglas October 1593
- 3) Lawrence Oliphant of Edinburgh at the  
Canongate 11 January 1602
- 4) Richard Douglas brother to the laird of  
Whittinge at the Canongate 4 February 1602
- 5) David Murray of Linhill at Edinburgh 26 February 1600
- 6) P Murray gentleman of his Majesty's privy  
chamber brother to Viscount Stormont at Baras 8 August 1597

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| 7) James Lumsden of Airdrie at Edinburgh   | 24 July 1590 |
| 8) A general bond continuing the bonds of the whole towns of Bonkle and Preston at Preston | 14 May 1596  |
| 9) A general bond of the whole name of Douglas and their dependers.                        | [n.d.]       |

From the above, certain facts may be deduced. First of all, the reason why the bonds are quoted is to show the importance of the named earl. This is the contemporary view of the bond. Seen through the eyes of the seventeenth-century author, these bonds are meant to show the power and influence of the earls who made them, and it is worth noting it is only the most influential and politically aware members of the house of Angus who are quoted in this context.

As stated already, the son of George the second was to build up a territorial power base, consolidating local strength in one particular area and for this purpose the bond was a most useful tool. With Archibald Bell the Cat, the situation is rather different: the aim is political and the geographically wider-reaching nature of the bonds suggests an unstable political situation, with the attempt of Angus to have as many friends/allies as possible.

One would have expected rather more bonds in the name of Archibald who married Margaret Tudor since he was certainly the most powerful earl, but probably the most significant fact was, having royal 'in laws' he was more concerned with alignments at that level. It is significant that 1525 and 1526 predominate - the years when, having returned from England, he was about to engage in a power struggle with the Hamiltons over custody of the young king.



With James, fourth earl of Morton the years 1557 and 1558 are of particular significance. Because he was such a political animal and at that time his contemporaries did not know which way he was going to jump, the bonds can be interpreted as hedging his bets and keeping a foot in both camps until, with the return of Mary, he decided.

Regarding Archibald 'the third of that name', 1574 and 1576 are most significant, relating to the time when he was lieutenant general south of the Forth and at the same time trying to show some independence of his uncle.

The greatest activity as far as William 'who died in Paris' is concerned relates to the periods when he was reinstated after his rebellion and when he resumed the Catholic religion, perhaps aware of the consequences of this and trying to form a kind of security.

To sum up, the 'bonds of manred' listed above can be interpreted many ways and can be seen as a Greek chorus commenting on the activities of the earls concerned. But it is noteworthy that, with perhaps the exception of William, it is the most powerful and influential earls that are listed. Perhaps most significant is the fact that they could be interpreted as indicating the number of men one could put on a field of battle, together with the fact that the bonds are most copious in periods of political uncertainty and upheaval.

## APPENDIX B

THE ANGUS AND HAMILTON MANUSCRIPTS

From the Angus manuscript, which is a verbatim copy of the second part of the Hamilton manuscript, can be deduced what the eleven missing pages comprised, although why they should have been cut out remains a matter of conjecture.

This was the beginning of the Glenbervie line of the house of Angus. It is stated that Archibald wrote to his cousin to come to Dalkeith for a second time, 'who being arrived he found ther with the earle Mr John and Mr Thomas Nicollson breithern and lawiers consulting with him touching the disponing of his estait and worldly afayres' and being asked what he had done about his son's religion, he replied he 'could give his lordship no other certaintie of mynd in matters of religion than what his lordship had learned of him at their last conference'. When Angus replied he was 'sorie that his obstinacie should be a way to his losse', no doubt Glenbervie feared the worst, but Angus stated that nothing was to be gained by force and he had always found the son to have a 'verie duetiful behaviour and honorable carriadge' and he had no intention of giving offence to any of his name, and so would leave these two earldoms of Angus and Morton as he found them.



This is followed up by an account of the King's unsuccessful disputation of the succession and Jean Lyon, later married to Lord Spynie 'his Majestie's special favourite for the time', taking from Tantallon the charter chest which was returned for 40,000 marks 'whereof the discharge is yet extant'. Other depredations are referred to: Maitland's acquisition of Braidwood along with 5,000 merks and the financial support exacted by the king in a campaign against Huntly.

It is then stated that at this time the king was considering marriage with the Infanta but there was so much opposition from 'the ministers and Queen of England who granted James £3,000 sterling yearlie which was called for the Lennox landes in England that King James had a title to'. Then it states that the earl of Huntly, Erroll and Crawford made an offer to the king that the king of Spain would give '20,000 crowns yearlie for maintaining a guard about his Majestie for the suppression of the puritan party and such courtiers of that faction whom they knew his Majestie had never a lyking to'. Reference is also made to this being leaked to Bowes and the ensuing pension to the 'four kings of Edinburgh', i.e. the four ministers Bruce, Balcanquhal, Balfour and Watson. Money, it states, was given at their behest also to Argyll. This section ends with the statement that William intended to disinherit his eldest son but the second son predeceased him.

Why these pages were cut out is difficult to say other than the fact that the king is not portrayed in a very favourable light. The reference to the king's unsuccessful claim to the inheritance could not be seen as diplomatic and would not make for agreeable reading for the royal reader who had requested the work, or for his son.

## APPENDIX C

David Hume's History of the Humes of Wedderburn

Dedication: To the most noble and most powerful Earl of Angus and George Wedderburn his brother, David Hume gives greetings.

I would not think it necessary most noble and esteemed lord and dearest brother to give an account of why I thought at some time past to consecrate to posterity the deeds of our ancestors, or even now I have begun why I should desist. The former was a matter of rectitude and a willing mind. The latter could seem to be the mark of fickleness or negligence: therefore, to be washed away, I shall explain that, but in a few words. I realised that the matter was in hand, the task already contemplated by another, the material already gathered, perhaps even the foundation laid and to some extent a building rising. Lest I be so unjust as to seize this little glory or to snatch it from another, no matter how little it be, rather let me have helped by whatever means I am able; I shall have stirred up and added goads as it were to someone already in flight. But he is too slow for my liking. However, great responsibility lies in your hands. In your control are the memorials and writings of history. These must be discussed by you, material must be gathered and heaped up for the workmen if you want it to be worthwhile. The more the matter affects you, the

more honour is there in it for you. It is through you that you yourselves will be honoured and your ancestors known to the world - their ability, their courage, worthy of imitation, the example of their moral excellence, and where they have lapsed, their errors an example to be avoided. From time to time it has irked me when scanning the history of our country to find so little mention of our own people, scarcely one or two and they with merely casual mention, and yet their exploits were not so slight viz. exceptional bravery against the enemy, clemency, generosity towards their friends, munificence, courtesy, trustworthiness, piety and respect for their prince. Indeed no race was more devoted to its country nor has dedicated itself more to it. It may irk you all the more that these things are unnoticed. Take care they are not kept silent from now on. I am giving the introduction and outline as best I can of deeds of honour and distinction, omitting what is best unsaid, and perhaps a pen more equal to the task or at least who can do it with more impartiality will finish the task. Farewell and the excellence of our ancestors either equal or surpass, do not dishonour them and be ornaments to posterity, 8.8.1611.

To David Hume of Wedderburn my brother's son. About to place before you the portraits of your ancestors, I do not think this will be displeasing or superfluous or unfitting since I am equally affected. Whether they

excite praise or infamy at least we are different from those foolish generations who neither know nor care whence they are descended, neither imitating the virtue or shunning the vice of their ancestors. But those of superior disposition consider the matter with greater care and are zealous to adorn their honourable family with honest morals and to redress the balance of the less honourable aspects. Our ancestors are no small part of us: whenever they are famous let us rejoice, be ecstatic and imitate them; whenever they act in a disreputable fashion let us grieve, let us recognise and let us shun. This is my attitude which I commend to you. You will see men who are not unseemly, famous with great virtues, like gentlefolk and yet sadly with no children; you will see courage, greatness of mind and especially that rare love of country and sense of duty which existed at that time, defending their dependants and their friends, and preserving zealously and earnestly protecting the good name of the chief of their house. He who does not direct his life along these lines denies his own ancestors. But I make this concession: when one looks more carefully at the mistakes one realises the errors were not so much of the persons themselves as of the age they lived in. It was an age of soldiers not philosophers, less studious of what was right and just, than of honour and glory, an attitude which is still too prevalent and which I wish rather than hope, to see altered. Others that come after

us may see that too.

David the First Chief of Wedderburn

Meanwhile I endeavour to delineate for you the portraits of your ancestors not fashioned from bronze or skilful portraiture but from the obscure memorials of letters or testimonials, not from a twin egg as they say. I shall not deduce my history from the pedigree of ancient Bar nor from the ancient name of Dunbar, from the race of the Dukes of March, (these things may be written by another more fully, on whose work I shall not trespass) nor the ancestors of the Hume family before removal thence. All these facts are common knowledge whereas it is my intention to touch upon the private matters of the house of Wedderburn. I neither confirm nor refute the fact, merely point it out, that it was the tradition that the son of the earl of March, after a contest with a French champion who was going round the country looking for a challenge, was presented by his father, because of his courage, with the Hume estate where the bastion of that name now stands and it is commonly held to be the place from which his descendants got their name. I do not have the means to refute this rumour which is bandied about but I rather incline to another which is confirmed by memorials which are still extant. Philip, an outlaw, despising king and law (as was common at that time even among the English) who led



so great a band of robbers that he could not be taken except by a regular army, hid in woods and remote places. He had two strongholds from which he harrassed the earl of March who ruled over these regions: the one the pinnacle of Hume Crag, the other three or four miles away, fortified with a threefold rampart and ditch which to this day is called after him, Philipstane. William the son of the earl, meeting Philip by chance killed him and gave his head to his father. The King on account of that granted him Hume and the fields adjacent and from there arose and flourished the race of Hume who took their name from that place. I leave the matter in doubt as befits all things so far back in antiquity. What surprises me is that the Dunbars and the family of the earl of March claimed the name for themselves many years later. It is agreed that in 1434 in the time of James I George Dunbar had been deprived of the earldom of March by decree of the King's Council, yet in 1413 nearly twenty years before not only Alexander of Dunglass but David Hume of Wedderburn were both called Hume and that was not only by common repute but by the very estates assigned by the earl of March. If it is the case, as I hear, that among the ancestors of the house of Hume, there was a William, clearly said to be the son of the earl of March, the matter is in no doubt; we will have argued in vain, and will not dwell on it. It is reasonable to believe those things that are part of

tradition.

William is said to have begotten a son John and he Thomas. Thomas was said to be the Lord of Hume and Dunglass, the former by inheritance from his father and the latter by marriage. For he, Thomas, married the heir of the man surnamed Parrot, the proof of which is now fixed in the arm bearings of Hume: Six parrots for Hume and three for Wedderburn with two silver lions. Thomas begat by her an elder son Alexander and David, who, enlarged by the estate of Wedderburn took it as his title and handed it down to his descendants (He was fourth from William, the son of the Earl). I remember, as a boy, hearing that our ancestors had held the estate of Thurston long before that of Wedderburn and it was even doubted by some whether he or his brother had been the elder but I note that our historians have always gone by this and to me it seems more likely. I shall not deny or dispute this account and there is sufficient evidence which claims for them the ancient possession of Thurston in 1441 but I do not see that as being as longstanding as that of Wedderburn which probably began 1413 or 1400. Moreover, the lands of Wedderburn were granted by Archibald, earl of Douglas, who likewise declared himself lord of Galloway and Annandale as well as Wedderburn. But who was this Archibald since there were three of the same name 1) The Grim 2) Touraine 3) Earl of Wigton, and the charters of the time give no additional

information? It is not clear but for the fact that it is confirmed before the time of Wigton in 1413 and falls into the twelfth or thirteenth year of Touraine yet this does not disallow the fact that a general charter could have been issued by Archibald the Grim himself. Whoever he is, he recognised the great service of David Hume who is designated 'Shield bearer' and in no other way. This was a very honourable name in those days, whether or not the gift was made for such service. Afterwards he enrolled as a Knight of the Golden Order as can be seen from certain writers of the year 1407. From whom, however, and for what merits he acquired that office is uncertain. There is evidence that he had a wife called Alice and sons David (whom he survived) and Alexander, because in the year 1450 he resigned the lands of Wedderburn into the hands of King James II at Stirling and received them back for himself, his wife Alice and his heirs i.e. George the heir of his lately deceased son David, (George his grandson) and George's children if any; then for the brother of George, Patrick the second heir and his children and thirdly for Alexander the brother of the dead David and all his male heirs. Such was his sense of duty and family to the dead man's children, and to his brother's children. It plainly showed or even surpassed the trust his brother had in him. For when David had joined the Duke of Touraine's expedition to France, and was setting out, already on

board ship, Alex after escorting the Duke to the ship embraced his lord who said "I don't believe, Alexander, that anything can divide us". To which he replied "And nothing ever shall" and changing places with his brother he indicated that he was determined to undertake the journey and if anything befell him, he trusted the care of his brother. So taking his arms and equipment, he sailed with the Duke to France and was killed along with him at Vermeuil. David undertaking the care of the orphans administered their estate with astonishing loyalty and prudence, for he greatly increased the estate of Alexander who was the eldest and made the two younger, Thomas and George (others call him James) owners of Tynninghame and Spott respectively, buying up those lands for them, setting a rare and celebrated example. And yet inevitably a dispute arose between him and the said Alexander (or his son as I would rather believe) concerning the lands of Aldcamus and the right to the jurisdiction of Coldingham (called the Baillory), which David had received from the abbot John Drake. What law or right he invoked I don't know but the matter was brought to arbitration. Adam Hepburn, called lord of Galloway and Hales, and Patrick his eldest son, along with Patrick Hepburn, governor of Waughton, and friends they had in common, discussed the matter and decided it could not be sustained. They upbraided Alexander with weighty speech in that he had not acted towards his uncle

in friendly fashion by acquiring Aldcamus, and yet they left it in his hands and divided the jurisdiction of Coldingham and awarded half to Alexander. And that he might take care to cultivate their friendship it was decreed that if any doubt arose, the right of interpreting it was reserved to the arbiters 12th October 1441 which was carefully transcribed (or if you prefer) adopted by David the following year 12th May in the court of Cockburnspath. David was afterwards distinguished by the title of Knight, after to be possessed by others. But when or for what reason he acquired that honour which is usually bestowed in battle, I have not discovered. But when the matter was not quite settled the dispute began to augment with other cases besides. For Alexander drove off cattle from David's lands of Upsetlington, Flemington and Wedderburn, under what pretext I know not, and claimed the tithes of Thurston from David which he seized, and claimed an ambush had been set for himself and Drake the abbot of Coldingham returning from Stirling. Therefore, when Adam Hepburn of Hales came on to David's side (I believe because it seemed as if his decision had been spurned by Alexander) and George Hume siding with Alexander, James Douglas earl of Angus took up the matter and finally decided it in this manner: David strenuously denied that an ambush had been laid for Alexander whom he confessed he would zealously defend from all injury from whatever source, though he absolved



himself less clearly as far as the abbot was concerned because the abbot I think was in Alexander's company and the wrong would redound upon him. David was ordered to ask pardon, Alexander to restore the cattle, in addition 80 sheep and 35 oxen. He abandoned his uncertain claim to the tithes and the matter was to be settled in twenty days until a more accurate examination be made. Alex was ordered to remove his army from the tower of the abbey of Coldingham and neither of them should place any troops there henceforth. Angus decided that they should share the right of jurisdiction and revenue of Coldingham equally and they should allow the monks to celebrate their divine offices as was their wont without violation from either party. This is everything that we consider worth relating about him. He died in the month of March 1469. In accordance with the decree of 15 men whereby the succession was decided (it is called a retour), George was declared his heir and successor to the Wedderburn lands. It is uncertain if this man was really the grandfather of George, it is equally probable it was a son of the same name so that there were three of the name David before George. This suspicion is occasioned by the great age of this man viz. 89 or 93 or thereabouts. For if we count from the year 1414 in which he received royal confirmation of the lands of Wedderburn to the year 1469 it is fifty five years, yet it is agreed that the confirmation of the earldom of March was prior



to the royal confirmation and that too before the judgement of the earl of Douglas which leads us to 1400 as the likely date when he first got this land. Nor is it likely he was a boy at this time but a man of 20/24 years of age that would suggest his birth was in 1375 or 1380 which, if we count to the year of his death, makes him 93 or at least 89. Concerning his death I find nothing certain but the story prevails that there was no one of that family before the fifth David your grandfather and my father but was slain by the English with the exception of this man's son about whom we will now talk.

#### David the Second

We have not discovered when this man was born and when he died, but we know he was a man in 1441 when he criticised the decision we mentioned above, given in that year by Hepburn of Hales. He is mentioned everywhere along with his father. That he died before 1450 is evident from the charter already mentioned which was given by the King which assigned his sons as heirs to the previous David as he himself was deceased. One memorable deed of his that is handed down is that he captured and led to deserved punishment Robert Graham the assassin of James in Strathfountain or as it is sometimes described Fountain Valley (that part of the Lammermuirs being full of woods at that time). He had to wife Elizabeth Carmichael,

Graham's own widow whom we see from a retour survived to the year 1494. That is about 56 years after her husband's death. From that same retour it appears that she afterwards married George Carr of Samilston and bore to him Nicola Carr, sister to George David's son. Nicola married Alexander Hume, the first Lord High Chancellor, and brought forth numerous offspring 1) Alexander second lord High Chancellor of Scotland 2) George who succeeded Alexander 3) John 4) William who was slain with his brother at Edinburgh 5) Patrick governor of Fast castle 6) Thomas of Cockburnspath 7) Andrew abbot of Jedburgh 8) David of Coldinghame who, young and innocent, was destroyed. I cannot say who or of whom this Carmichael was. I would only note that there is a Peter Carmichael whom Archibald earl of Angus called brother, having the same mother and to whom he sold the lands of Horsenpleugh in 1485. As it is, David, returning from Edinburgh, was warned not to travel through the Pancrake hills because some young Lothian notables were said to be brigands there, waylaying travellers and despoiling them of their goods. He thought it would be a disgrace to deviate from his path and a fierce battle was fought whereby he routed the brigands. He himself being wounded was ordered to abstain from his wife but since he did not restrain himself enough he contracted a fever from which he died, while his father was still alive. He left behind two

sons, George and Patrick, as mentioned above. He also left a daughter Sybil whom George affianced to Henry Heatley of Mellerstain declaring a dowry of 200 marks to be paid in such a way that 20 marks was to be handed over at the end of each year until the whole was paid up. Her guarantors were Alexander Hume and George Wedderburn, and George Kerr and George Carmichael, treasurer of Glasgow, her cautioners; the former her stepfather and the latter her uncle.

#### George the first

He is believed to have succeeded his grandfather David whether first or second. The first mention of him is in 1461 in the Kimmerghame records, but a good while earlier he had married Marion Sinclair whose sister, Margaret, his brother Patrick had married. They were the daughters of John Sinclair and his only heirs, and of Catherine Hume the sister of Alexander the Lord Chancellor and about to succeed by law to the whole patrimony of Hermiston of which their father had been the rightful heir. But when he died, the girls' grandfather who was still alive, handed to William his second son any rights he had and so he came to inherit those lands, particularly in Lothian which his dead son had not come in to. The rest, which were in the Merse, the girls' husbands divided between themselves with such restraint that he who was the younger and had married the younger

was adjudged everywhere to have received the better portion. A rare example of fraternal and sisterly love, they lived together in the same house for 18 years and proof of this is that George named Patrick his heir after his sons. The present house of Polwarth takes its name from Patrick. In addition he was highly thought of by James IV whose Treasurer he became. He seldom lived in the country, being mainly at Court. Since George stayed so much at home, in his own estates in the Merse he had practically supreme authority since his chief Alexander was little more than a youth. There is one deed in particular that is told of him, in which he laid low the English invading Scotland at Mellerstain. This has been handed down by our ancestors and is celebrated both in oral tradition and folk song. This is how it happened. Percy, earl of Northumberland, having gathered together a sizeable army (there are said to have been up to 5000 men) boasting that he would shame the Humes by driving off their cattle, charged out of Berwick through the March gate into Scotland, plundering as far as Aldcarness. The Scots who dwelt nearby were aroused by the shouting, and those who lived farther away, realising by the flames that the English had arrived, and unable to stop the plundering, came together in an irregular band and assembled at Mellerstain, either by chance, or hoping to catch the English on their return. Mellerstain is now famous on account of the battle that ensued. It is

situated on the inner Ay, the banks of which are very irregular and in most places of difficult access. There is also that Billian marsh which is barely passable, only one horseman at a time, by a narrow ford. A steep summit closed the jaws of the passage, down which it was easy to charge on the enemy, or from which take possession of one of the overhanging hills which stretch in a long ridge almost to the sea and where the English returning to Berwick must cross. There were few Scots there, as is to be expected in a sudden emergency - it is said 800, yet they were determined to do battle if the chance of a successful result should arise. By common consent George Hume of Wedderburn was appointed leader and they eagerly awaited the enemy. He ordered them to dismount and moved first his own horse and then the other horses out of sight and they awaited battle on foot. Meanwhile Percy, having ravaged everything at his ease, and seeing no opposition, was returning to England with a not unconsiderable amount of plunder, when he saw on the hill the Scottish line drawn up for battle. That gave him cause for deliberation. Selby was asked his opinion, and whether because of secret rancour between himself and Percy, as some think, or whether through friendship to Wedderburn with whom there had been a private friendship as far as was possible in the general hostility, or rather, as the event proved, making a just evaluation of the locality, his own men and the enemy since he was



experienced as few were, both in warfare and border warfare, he advised against battle. He stated that the enemy were fierce, enraged and that Wedderburn was brave, most hostile and unmoved by the English reputation. He said that Berwick was not far distant, and was a safe retreat if they escaped immediately with utmost speed. Percy did not want to hear this and cursed the man and upbraided him as being a person who had repeatedly planned nothing but escape throughout his life. He then called a certain Bredford. He pointed out that flight for so great an army would be a disgrace in the face of battle, and advised to trust to the archers to direct their arrows against their adversary. In this way they would make trial of the enemy's courage and if they could be dispersed by that method it would be a good thing, but he did not deny that it would be a difficult battle with the outcome by no means a foregone conclusion. Percy, adopting this opinion as more honourable, released a shower of arrows and gave orders for battle to commence. He drew up his battle line on the hill opposite and the Scots did not long delay in giving battle, in anger for what they had lost, expectation of recovering it, and anxious to refute the boastfulness of the enemy. Relying on their long spears they charged from their higher position and a fierce battle ensued. Soon the English were driven from their position and, in disorderly flight, made for the nearest hills. Few were killed in



the action and none after it, since the Scots used moderation in victory, striving, as it were, only for glory. Some were captured among them Selby, who had advised against the battle, fighting fiercely. At night fall since the horses had been removed beforehand to a greater distance from the engagement, and Berwick being so near, all the rest got to safety. George's reputation was greatly enhanced by that encounter: the enemy's spirit had been broken and they were in fear of him; among his own men a victory had been won, and his authority established as long as he lived. He made that part of the Borders more peaceable, but he did not live long after. Barely a year later he set out on horseback for his house at Polwarth, unarmed and unaccompanied as if in time of peace. About half a mile from his house at Wedderburn he heard a noise like that made by quarrymen beside a river, a little way below but it was the English making a sortie. He turned and not waiting for his bodyguard, took his spear in indignation and dislodged from his horse the first man he met. The English, thinking that his retinue was not far off, at first fled, but when they saw no one they turned and went back. George, careless of himself and without armour, trusting to his horse, resumed his journey. But his horse fell, either collapsing spontaneously or because his ham had been cut by a missile and George fell into the hands of the enemy. But after he surrendered, he was slain.

Whether a quarrel had arisen by chance between the Borderers and Midlanders as to whose prisoner he was, or that they took the opportunity to kill him, it is agreed that he was struck a blow, and, being a high spirited man, George stabbed his guard because he had not prevented the injury. Whereupon he was killed by the rest. He was, above all, a brave and wise man who increased his patrimony by marriage and purchase adding Polwarth and Kimmerghame to his former estate. He put a mortgage on Ramrigs and got Hume house from Edmiston. He also founded the Wedderburn castle or at least added towers to it. Certainly built by him was the tower above the bridge, as the inscribed stones testify. His slaughter occurred in 1497, on 14th May. He left David who succeeded him, John who was a man of letters and gained an MA, rare in that century and in that area as among soldiers. He was present at the murder of de la Beauté along with his nephew. We know this because he was pardoned for the affair. About George we have composed the following

O noble Lord, with the invincible glory of Mars  
splendid with lightning, O hero the equal of the  
ancient gods The warlike Merse can boast of no  
offspring more than you, nor sing the praises of such  
a leader with greater utterance, whether you engage  
squadrons armed with spears and range standards and  
men against men, or with sword threaten from afar, and  
as an object of dread engage in skirmishes with a  
light armed band. Fame was won at Valla and you can  
be compared to the god of war.

David the third

David succeeded him, a son worthy of such a father, a man whose courage his father had overshadowed by his greatness, but which was revealed on his death. For he is the man who emulated the glory of the battle at Mellerstain in the fight at Kella. A month or two after the slaying of George as recounted above, the English prepared an expedition to Scotland under whose leadership is not agreed among our historians other than that he bore a Dun cow on his insignia. Alluding to which he repeatedly stated that he would see to it that it bellowed on the hill overlooking Duns. He is said to have had 3000 men in his army in close formation. They reached Hilton where they sent ahead lightly armed troops who by the speed of their march would come on the Scots who were in their fields and estates unawares. They marched insolently past Wedderburn castle. Those who were there in arms, i.e. the attendants of the deceased George, with David's permission, at the instigation of his mother made a sortie. This woman, George's widow, was of manly disposition, offered £10, which was a fair sum in those days, to the man who would kill an Englishman, as an offering to the shades of her husband. Thus making a sortie against the stragglers, they killed four of the foremost. It is said they then went swiftly back into the castle taking this to be a good omen for the future battle. The English persisted in their attempt with no diminution of effort, and reaching the

aforementioned hill set up their standard on the summit, burned the town and plundered the surrounding country. On that very day Patrick Hume, brother of the deceased, having heard of his brother's slaughter had come to the Merse, having left the court where he spent most of his time by reason of his office. He had come anxious for vengeance but after waiting for some time and thinking the enemy were not going to be making a move, had made ready to return to court, and that very day chanced to be crossing the rise of Langton edge when he saw numerous features blazing, a sure proof of the enemy's arrival. Wherefore, changing his plan he returned to his people with all possible speed, joined up with David who had already armed himself, and embracing him, exhorted him that they should not endure the plundering of their native land or let the tragedy of his father's death and the enemy insults go unavenged. Full of wrath and hope he welcomed his friends and dependants who were rushing up to him from all sides. He repeated the same ideas to them and advised them to follow him as leader in this vengeance. When he had gathered 500 horsemen together, concealing the horses and the men as best he could, he chose the site of the battle at the confluence of the Wedderburn and Blackadder rivers where he anticipated the enemy would return. It is the nature of the place that it cannot be seen until quite near and from higher ground. He sent out 60 specially selected horsemen to

surround the enemy scouts and distract them so they would not draw near to or discover the ambush. He gave instructions to his men to go down on foot and when they got near the ambush, to release the horses thinking the result would be, as actually happened, that some part of the enemy, eager to capture the horses, would be diverted from the battle. Assistance in this matter was given in no small degree by William Cockburn governor of Langton, a man considered to be more brave than prudent, who, with his own private company, had ridden up to the enemy, as soon as they arrived, and skirmished throughout the day. The sixty horsemen joining up with this man performed as instructed so vigorously that the English had no idea of the ambush, thinking there were no more than a few men before them and did not pay them much attention, since they were in casual formation and merely leaping around at individuals. If anyone offered himself rashly, it was dealt with but did not interrupt their retreat. The English kept to their chosen course and so came close to the ambush at which point the scouts leapt from their horses in a dense mass with spears at the ready, seemingly offering themselves to the whole English army. They, at the same time, sent away the best of the horses. The Borderers, and they were the fiercest men, seeing that, greedily pursued the horses too far and were absent from the battle. All the rest, not admiring, rather despising the boldness of the few men, had not prepared



themselves for battle, when those in the ambush sprang up and with the loudest possible warcry, attacked. Whereupon the army tried everything at once: to dismount, to form their lines and deploy their ranks. But in vain. They were thrown into confusion, impeding one another and the first to dismount were slain. The remainder, thinking of their own best interest, were routed and fled. The victors by no means used the same clemency as they had at Mellerstain. There was a cry on all sides that they should remember the inhuman slaughter of George, contrary to the rules of war, and demanded punishment to the full. Accordingly, as many as they overtook, were slain. No prisoners were taken except those who escaped to Blackadder. They say it was crammed with such a multitude of fugitives that the houses and yards could not contain them. Inasmuch as the laird harboured a grudge against Wester Nisbet who was helping Wedderburn, he was neither greatly displeased at George's murder nor was he present at the battle led by George's son. He was more peaceably inclined towards the English and received them in surrender, sending them away the following day, unharmed and without ransom. After this injury, or insult, as David saw it, such great enmity blazed forth among the neighbouring families and was stubbornly maintained on both sides, with one cause of hatred arising from another that it finally caused the destruction of the family of Blackadder in that area.



There were one or two other incidents in this connection, which, though ridiculous, are not to be passed over. Langton, as we have already said, hurriedly rushed forward unarmed. When he saw the conflict imminent, he ordered his men to dismount. This they did. However, out of concern for their overlord they advised him to stay on his horse and not to throw himself, unarmed as he was, rashly against armed men. He said to them "Why don't I turn my skin tunic outside in. Since it is white inside it will give the appearance of a breastplate to the enemy". So saying, he leapt from his horse and became one with his people and fought so strenuously he won the highest praise from everyone. The second incident concerns the fact that a certain Boomakar or as we prefer Bowmaker fell by chance into the hands of the English. He is said to have pleaded with many tears, repeatedly saying that he had not been a participant in the battle of Kella which is the name of the village near which the battle had been fought. Nay, he was so blameless that at the very time of the conflict he was dining on brose at home. Both matters became proverbial, in use to this day: the breastplate of Langton and the purging of Bowmaker. The former defines confident bravery the latter cowardly innocence or innocent cowardice. But the exploit relayed to the court was pleasing to the king and rendered the Humes pleasing to him, and in princely gratitude he was pleased to bestow

the greater praise to the treasurer. At home the truth and public fame of David was recognised. He was now so formidable to the enemy and did not cease from avenging his father's death until the whole family (which was quite numerous) of him who was said to be the perpetrator of that slaughter, was either put to the sword or forced into exile so that no one of that name was found within 50 miles of the Border. About whom this poem:-

While I grieve for and avenge, mighty father, your impious slaughter against all the proper rules of a fair fight Kella saw me dutiful and not ignoble, and the perpetrator paid for his joys with a deserved death. Neither the Humber nor Tyne rejoices in your death. I have gone after them and the enemy land has paid the penalty. Alive, your glory overshadowed me, your death has given me a purpose and basis for praise and honour.

This same man at Flodden, the battle at which James IV was slain, did his duty bravely along with Alexander Hume the chief, and laying low the English who opposed him, made every effort along with Hume and the earl of Huntly, whom they had joined, to save one royal battle line when it was struggling. But he could not. With his squad he hurried thither and since he could do nought else, gave the example of love and loyalty for his chief, that fighting valiantly along with them he fell, together with his eldest son George. This is how he addressed his men, "Come hither, comrades, turn your victorious standards along the path that glory indicates. By your strong right hands and the brave deeds recently performed, even by your loyalty to your king, burst through this battle

line of enemy arms and standards. O sire, no shade will tell you that I could abandon my king as he rushed into battle. Yet, my son, you ought to have survived me. It is our fate to die together. Let me not see this or grieve for it". This George had been a man of high expectations and when his father had sent him back home on account of the hazards of war, in case both should succumb, he had lodged for the night on his return journey, at the monastery of Coldingham where he was on friendly terms with the abbess. There a silly woman reproached the young man's anxiety. At this insult, he was upset and speedily returned to his father, who could not persuade him to go back. He experienced domestic conflicts as well as foreign wars. For, in relation to Thurston which he and his ancestors had possessed and he was also heir to Coilum Craigie Wallace, - he waged a just war, burning the mansion, mill and tower. He drove off the cattle and put fear into the workmen, and yet no one was slain, a fact which people remember, and memorials record, so that he seems to have wished to terrify rather than kill. But I know how hateful this deed was and how both he and his posterity may be considered badly by some on account of it and there is the sacrosanct quality of the laws which are not to be violated. But there are crises in the times and affairs of man when the voice of the law cannot be heard, when injustice rules and the law itself is unjust. I do not

know what pretext he had, although it is possible there was a pretext that has escaped us. Similarly, wherein lay the justice of his actions. But it is generally agreed that at that time, men lived, not according to law, but fairness and goodness, and each man enjoyed the possessions of his ancestors provided they paid fully the returns and customary taxes owed to their lords. This was not unusual in more peaceable times. And so when people deprive ancient settlers of their farms they might be thought to act unjustly when in fact they act justly. This is the case even now. Just as there is the law which restrains the actions of men, so there is equity which restrains the actions of the law. According to our ancestral tradition Wedderburn, having received Dundonald, a royal fief, from the king, handed it over to Craigie as compensation for his possession of Thurston. Afterwards, they say, when the royal lands were subinfeudated or given to their possessors and Craigie was in possession of Dundonald, the fief was given to him, Wedderburn being passed over. Having been ignored as Craigie's beneficiary, and since he had the full right to Dundonald, they say he attempted to seize Thurston. While Craigie invoked the law, the other used fairness and good faith, which ought to be sacred among men. So, as it was, he settled the matter with force and prudence so that whatever else was done, Thurston was remitted to him. He had married Isabel Pringle the daughter of

Galashiels, of outstanding beauty and form, a woman with quality of mind from whom he gained many children, all warlike and active men of exceptional bravery 1) George about whom above 2) David who succeeded his father 3) Alexander 4) John 5) Robert 6) Patrick from whom the families of Manderston, Blackadder and Broomhouse in the Merse are descended 7) Andrew who studied literature and gained the laurel, which they call the testimony of studies 8) Bartholomew who, having set out for Glottia acquired certain lands there and from whom he who is now named Simpton, is descended. His daughter married Hamilton of Innerwick a noble man in Lothian. The family now there are descended from her and her son Alexander. He also had two daughters: one who married John Swinton and, when he died, William Cockburn, and the other who married Tyrie of Innerleithen. His own wife lived to the year 1545, mid December, as the writings testify i.e. 32 years after her husband's death.

#### David the Fourth

When the third David, a most worthy man as we have said, was slain at Flodden doing his duty for king and country, a man most praiseworthy on this account alone, along with his eldest son George, David his next son succeeded them. He was worthy of such a father and such ancestors and in no way second to them in love of country, bravery, and greatness of spirit. His first concern was that he might

enhance himself with a favourable marriage. This was indeed prudent since there is nothing in the human condition either more pleasant or more honourable to one's good name, more advantageous or respectable than a suitable and honourable marriage alliance; only by a great error of judgement or violent lust or some disgraceful stigma dishonoured. While contemplating such an advantage he considered Alice Douglas. She was the widow of William Blackadder of that ilk, sister of Archibald earl of Angus, a woman of outstanding beauty, remarkable for every quality and held in honour among all for her virtue. Accordingly, he married her with her brothers Archibald and George greedily advising a marriage which they thought would be advantageous to them. Although for a hundred years or more the family of Wedderburn had always been adherents of the Douglas family, nevertheless they affirmed the bond would be greater by this nearer tie and for that reason they themselves transacted the business and were sponsors and contractors for her as can be seen in the papers drawn up and autographed by them. Accordingly, he was next in the Merse after Alexander, his kinsman, who was the Great Chamberlain, and joined to him by a double relationship, since Alexander was the son of Nicola Kerr the sister of George Wedderburn and David was the grandson of Catherine Hume the aunt of Alexander through Marion Sinclair. Accordingly, as long as Alexander lived he was second,



and when he died he was first in that area in authority and bravery. He always showed himself to be a real friend and true enemy - a trusty and useful friend and a serious hostile enemy, fierce in avenging the death of a friend. All those who were kinsfolk by blood or friendship or those who, by whatever means, had become dependants, he never deserted and defended fiercely. Proof of that was the case of George Nisbet, and he always practised the enmities inherited from his father towards the Blackadder family which only terminated with their extinction. At that time it was considered the special care of noblemen that they should take up the causes of their friends and dependants as their own, and to such an extent they bound their friends to them with those devices, so that these friends had regard for them alone and were prepared to offer them property, life, indeed everything. He also enriched his brothers by whatever means he could, some by one method, some by another: John and Robert by the marriage of his stepdaughters who had been left the sole heirs of Blackadder; he enriched Andrew with the tithes of Lauder - he was called rector. This gave his brother the opportunity when the abbot of Dryburgh died. Dryburgh is situated on the left bank of the Tweed not far from Littledden a town in the Merse. Kerr of Littledden had already seized the convent and its revenues, according to some, or had decided to claim them. David, indignant

that Kerr was coming from Teviot into the Merse (on this side of the river) which inclined to his protection, got in first and brought the convent under his control, and occupied it with his own retinue. When Kerr arrived he changed his mind. Without much delay David handed the convent over to the next abbot having stipulated for Andrew the aforementioned tithes with the great goodwill of the abbot because he had driven off Kerr and kept everything intact. The state of affairs at that time was the greatest confusion. Everyone, even the most moderate, were constrained to do everything by force and not in a legal manner, and to defend themselves and their own by arms. David was more skilled in warfare than law, born and reared amid arms, with nature suggesting what reason demanded, and careless of what petty lawyers objected to, he can be seen to have arranged his life for that purpose and nowhere to have departed from it, if we accurately assess the accusations. By the exigencies of the times and by the very high position he held in a Border province, and, to a great extent, a military province, his whole life demanding nothing other than that he practised warfare either in internal wars, foreign wars or private quarrels. But the murder of Alexander the Chamberlain caused his greatest trouble. The murder plotted by Patrick Hepburn bishop of Moray was carried out by John the Governor with French encouragement and help, especially that of de la Beauté a

French noble who, dear to John was either the instigator of all his actions or partner in them. It will not be irrelevant to set before your eyes the whole matter researched in greater detail. Alexander Hume, the head of the house, was in great favour with James IV and made by him Great Chamberlain of Scotland (an office which his father before him had held). Warden of the Borders, he with his numerous families and dependants was practically in sole charge of the Merse, and far excelled the rest of the nobility in power. He had added Arran and Montgomery to his relations, having married his own sister to Arran and having married Montgomery's sister himself. He relied on these powers after the king's death at Flodden when the queen, by marrying, had lost the guardianship of the young king and there was no agreement among the leading nobility as to who should be regent. Hume supported John Stewart, son of the Duke of Albany, born in France after his father's exile, and fully committed to his candidature. He refused to listen to Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus who pointed out that he was now a foreigner connected to Scotland neither by language or knowledge of the Scottish way of life. No obligations of friendship could be expected of him, and the fact that the infant king would be in his power was not lacking in danger. By the child's life alone was he kept from being king. "Indeed", said Angus addressing Alexander by name and in a friendly fashion, "we should

rather divide up the country and you take the Borders and the region this side of the Forth and let me have the regions beyond the Forth, and the North".

Alexander, however, unmoved, declared openly before the Council that if the others hesitated, then he alone would bring John back. I believe that he distrusted his partner in government as, if any division should arise at any time he would be disadvantaged since Angus was supported by his kinship with the English king since he had married Margaret, Henry's sister. He too would have to depend on foreign help, but this could be expected from no other quarter than France and that only by Albany's assistance, a man who would be bound by gratitude and necessity, in the hope that he would trust no one more and that no one would use his efforts more. Therefore, he persisted and saw to it that the Duke was summoned from France, declared duke and earl of March and appointed Regent until the king came of age. When Hume heard that the Duke had arrived at Dumbarton he hurried to meet him. There are various rumours: some say that he went with his retinue and when the Duke saw he was of small stature and with a meagre retinue, not in accordance with the dignity he had anticipated, he turned contemptuously to those near him and said "His presence diminishes his reputation". On the other hand there are those who say he was closely attended by 10,000 horsemen and that the Duke, in indignation at that, had said this

force exceeded that of a private individual and could not be tolerated. Be that as it may, a few months later, before the end of the year, whether on his own inspiration or caused by the calumnies of his enemies, the Regent was so alienated from Hume that he showed his displeasure by turning his face away when in his company. Accordingly, disappointed in his hopes, Hume approached Angus and went over the suggestions he had spurned before, saying the king was not safe in Albany's charge and that he should take him to England and entrust him to his uncle. An informer reported this to the Regent and Hume withdrew to England with Angus and the Queen. The Regent, fearing that something worse would emerge from that quarter asked him to return, pledged his word, made every promise and finally persuaded him. When he returned soon after, the Regent, careless of his word, called him to trial and when he did not appear, condemned him, confiscated his property and incited him to arms. He led an army against him as he was getting ready. However, on the advice of friends he was encouraged to surrender to the earl of Arran, his sister's husband, on condition that his sentence be removed immediately he surrendered, but he was committed to prison. Accordingly, fearing for himself, and indignant, he escaped and took Arran with him. A second time they prepared for war but the matter was settled with the mediation of Forman. And so he returned to court, and

from there to his own estates, where he lived peaceably and the Regent went to Falkland. Whether as a result of suspicion of some kind or another (I know not what they were or where they came from, as there is no evidence), or of inveterate hatred, the Regent, not content that he had not show gratitude, devised his death, and because he could not rely on force of arms, prepared a trick. A parliament was proclaimed at Edinburgh on 24th September. To it Hume was coaxed by every ruse, enticed with promises, offered wealth and distinction both openly and secretly; even his friends were bribed or deceived. And this paid off. For whether induced by expectations or thoroughly weary of war he listened more readily. On the other hand, there are those who argue otherwise: the Regent with a vice common to rulers was suspicious of an almost rival power and also irritated, as he himself said, by so many rebellions. One is deceived if one thinks these things would be forgotten; the memories of recent quarrels remain before one's eyes, to be stored up for future vengeance. The nature of feuds is tenacious and there would be no shortage of evil-wishers who would not allow them to die down, and would not trust a reconciled enemy. That being the case, not to dash his family's hopes at one fell blow he should have left his brother William at home; for he, William, was almost as great as himself in authority. Whether on account of his strength, readiness to help, and wisdom, or believing the



nearest family being less liable to envy than those more remote, or as a security, while the one was safe no harm should be done, spurning advice he went ahead, as if by destiny, accompanied by his brother and Andrew Kerr of Ferniehurst. When they came to court they were immediately put in separate custody. A few days later they were brought forth to answer charges, condemned and executed: Alexander on 11th October, his brother the following day. Their possessions were forfeit to the state; their heads with their eyes blazing hatred, even after their death, were fixed on a conspicuous public place either to cause greater shame or to preserve the appearance of law, in accordance with the decision of the council that the crime and punishment should be made public. On what precise charges they were executed is difficult to say, there was no new matter and although the killing of the king is mentioned, it was James earl of Moray, his bastard who made the accusation. If there was any undeniable charge against him it would have to be the recent disturbance. The appearance of justice was sought for the slaughter because people were raging with indignation and disapproval. If treachery is esteemed and praised then nothing is safe. What was the point of being pardoned if the penalty had to be paid? Why had he paid the penalty if pardon had been given? Was it anything other than deceit? But there was no honour in removing by treachery a man you could not remove by

courage. What was this, other than a confession of weakness, unworthy in a prominent person and base in a ruler? Why had he not attacked him as an enemy in arms rather than in a state of peace, a man who had already entrusted himself to him? The former action was noble and honourable and appropriate for imposing terror on wrongdoers. The latter course was base and a disgraceful example against good faith, and human society is based on good faith. Without good faith there would be civil war and everlasting sedition, with no hope of reconciliation if it is safer for those who succeed than those who give up. If there was more danger in pardon than in fighting, who would hereafter entrust himself to pardon? Regarding the Humes, their friends and even those not too well disposed to them felt pity for their dreadful fate and horror at the atrocity of the action. Those views were put before the Regent by various factions. The main blame rested upon Hepburn bishop of Moray as instigator of the atrocity. Being disappointed in his expectation of the bishopric of St Andrews, he had become obsessed with a private vendetta and fuelled Albany's own suspicions. He argued that the spirit of the Humes had to be broken and their indomitable friends overcome by the sword. In the Regent's absence what would not such a person dare who had caused so many disturbances with the Regent present? Whose authority wouldn't he despise when he had so often despised that of the Regent? With

this in mind he had increased his wealth, influence and power in fact everything to rival the Regent. He had a restless mind and practically aspired to kingship, of which only the name was lacking. He would not miss an opportunity. What would he find when he came back from France? There would be no point thinking about it after Hume had seized control of government either personally or by means of someone else. He had to deal with him now not wait till it was too late. With words such as these it is believed Hepburn drove a mind, sick in itself, to the extinction of the Humes. Certainly inasmuch as he was a shrewd man, under the guise of giving good advice and knowing the ways of their forebears he had so insinuated himself into the company of the Regent, that he was almost the only person he would trust, and with him alone he conversed about important matters. Hepburn was hostile to Hume because the charter of the bishopric of St Andrews which Hepburn claimed, had been given by the Pope to Forman. Hume had then involved himself since the Forman family had long been dependants of the Humes and Alexander was bound to him by a recent act of kindness whereby David, Alexander's brother received the priory of Coldingham. The matter was honourably and justly dealt with. However, a man of overweening pride, Hepburn did not know the difference between right and wrong where he was himself concerned and plotted the Hume destruction with the Regent. So it is said and most

likely it was the malice of Hepburn that caused what was supposed to be the Regent's idea. This was how he showed his gratitude for the care, good faith and grace of the man who had brought him from exile, made him an earl, given him the reins of government and placed him not far from the kingship. Even if it was the case that Hepburn made these calumnies, Albany, for his part, gave a ready ear. Albany could not have done that, since Hepburn's hatred was no secret and obvious to all, if he had considered either the obligation of gratitude or justice. In short whatever treachery there was on the part of Hepburn there was on Albany's part enticement, oathbreaking, deceit, injustice and cruelty. Alexander was an ambitious man I well believe but this was not the price to pay for it nor is it I think a capital offence. Who pray among the nobles was free of this charge if it is considered a crime and who is even now free of it? But he had sent brigands against peaceful men and permitted them to make a foray. I know this was said and I also know as does anyone who knows the customs of the Borders in a state of unrest, they do not have to be launched. They neither ask permission nor are they obedient to or compliant with their chiefs, since they know themselves who needs support. Nor do their chiefs punish them. But Albany in this way built up the security of his regime and left for France - but what security! For as soon as good faith is removed it will

not last. And this was what happened both regarding himself and the Frenchman he left in charge. Indeed he caused hatred among all. There were adverse rumours among the common people, and the nobility were not so much happy at the removal of a rival as terrified by the example. No more would there be any good faith, as could be seen a few years later when he led a foray against the English in the Solway and at Wark and the Frenchman was killed in his absence. The killing of the Frenchman was the penalty for the treachery. In the case of the Regent, people's minds were so alienated that his Regency was ended before due time, and this through the agency of those same men who had given their pledge they would make no change, mocking artifice with artifice, not so much with the precocity of the king as with a conspiracy of the leading nobles and hatred of an oathbreaker. On the other hand, there was the fact that no art on his part had achieved anything, although by removing some, imprisoning some and taking others as hostages to France with him he thought he had taken precautions against any eventuality. His perfidy got its just reward. This perfidy can never be criticised enough by those who love the truth or shunned by those who follow honour and renown. This misfortune to our estate and plague in human affairs reached the highest pinnacle of government. Instead of an example of wisdom he was a magnet for those involved in flattery and supported by sycophants and

flatterers. What can we say? Considering this one example it seems to me there are judgements to be given: from the fall of Hume that too much ambition is sinful and such empty things can never be spurned enough; regarding Albany that no order in society can allow treachery and trickery. For a man to wish to exalt himself as far as he can is less odious since it seems rather a fact of nature and also to wish to seize what belongs to nobody else. That is not considered a failing since it hurts nobody but it is seldom restricted by justice and fairness and when it has gone too far it is especially disagreeable and troublesome to others. On the other hand, to break one's word is unjust, not so much a single move against one person as against the human race and relationships ordained by nature. That is why everywhere oathbreaking is abominated and execrated above all other crime. Nay more than that, it is an object of disgrace and contempt as the undisputed offspring of cowardice and weakmindedness and takes its origin from no other source. It blossoms nowhere more abundantly than in minds that are especially fearful and distrustful of their own courage. It is deservedly despised and hated by great men who do great deeds. Apart from the baseness of the deed which is always scurrilous, there is nothing more foolish in government since nothing alienates more the zeal of the people which should be encouraged by all possible means. Any great



man has avoided his tactics. It was foolish of him to believe that perfidy could lie hidden for long, as they allege, then to weigh up the advice of the sick minded and the slippery foundation on which you stand as if you accuse everyone you will like the bat remain undetected. Nor is the gain to be measured at the first appearance of success as the tables can turn and you can be overwhelmed yourself by those delighting in copying your example, if not openly, then secretly. The more such a crime has shameless supporters the more its enormity has to be emphasised. It is unacceptable that it should be thought of merely as a political act, it must be investigated by all skilful historians. I certainly censure it in order to detract wherever I can from those false politicians i.e. those who falsely claim to be politicians. It is not skill, rather the opposite, the shortcomings of the men themselves and the perdition of the human race. I wish to leave as evidence how I detest it and how I want everyone to abhor it. If any of our people dare to utter slanders because they perished through treachery let this much grace be shown. He, whoever he may be, since he gives this for the consideration of others has much more to be ashamed of: let truth always be the truth. Beyond which let him not be tendentious for the sake of friendship, or be a supporter through affectation of modesty. Let him be moderate in what he has written.

But to return to the matter. The same fate was avoided by Ferniehurst for he, whether less carefully guarded, or his guard being bribed was granted his request of one night in which to prepare his soul, gained his release and fled to his friends thus escaping the penalty. Yet the cruelty and treachery did not stop there, because there were those who could and would avenge the killing, who became the targets. After the elimination of the two Humes there still survived three brothers. All their actions were examined. George had previously fled to England, John the prior of Jedburgh who had moved beyond the Tay went in secret to Edinburgh. This was reported at court. Men at this point were sent to spy out his plans. They reported him as indulging in banquets and dancing in the company of women. This was his salvation as the Regent, despising him, said there was nothing to be feared from such a person. David the youngest was prior of Coldingham, a person of talent and lively wit, he stayed well back from court and met with friends to discuss what should be done. The restless minds of his enemies who had stained their hands with the slaughter of his brothers couldn't consider themselves safe as long as he survived. But there was no excuse for killing an innocent young man who had done nothing worthy of punishment, and so they secretly plotted his death. Since he did not in any way expose himself to them it was arranged with James Hepburn of Hales, his sister's

husband, to carry out the deed. Neither did the youth's innocence turn him from his purpose nor the secret bond of kinship and friendship stop him from perpetrating such a base crime. He called the young man, who trusted him, to a conference along with some companions. On his arrival he was cut down to the great sorrow of all even those who were accomplices in the crime. By one of them he was advised surreptitiously to mount his horse, of whose swiftness he boasted, and take to flight. But either not understanding, or not believing any danger possible at the hands of his kinsman, he did not. Off his guard, he was slain by one who of all men had least reason to do it. A blameless young man of rare ability and well mannered he was exceedingly popular with the people, to such an extent that to this day he is referred to as David the Innocent. But though people execrated it they did not avenge the crime. Divine will had reserved this thing for itself. For many years later, when the assassin had advanced to an old age, his body was bent with his face to the ground and he was unable to stand upright; he was reduced to penury, so that carried on a chair in public, he begged from passersby. He put a proxy in his place who strutted about with a stick as Master of Hales, this being the term for the nearest heir of the first rank among the nobility. He became a subject of remark and an example for all time. So pathetic was he that John Hume of Blackadder, meeting him

by chance, was advised by a retainer that here was an opportunity to take vengeance for the slaughter of David. He replied with a smile, "What has he done to merit such? Let him live, as he deserves, that his life which no man envies him be more bitter than any kind of death". Nor did the accomplices enjoy a better fate: Chirnside, Nisbet, Hetley of Mellerstain all had miserable deaths and their memory an object of execration. No one in that region remembers them except with ignomy and detestation for the slaughter of an innocent, as they call David, and pronounce them accursed traitors. These things are not to be passed over lightly so that everyone can be fully aware of what happened. Now let us return to where we digressed. When these notorious crimes had been committed, Albany feeling secure sailed for France. Before his departure, he left in charge of important matters, the earls of Angus, Arran, Huntly and the archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow. But their coordinator and overseer was to be de la Beauté, the Frenchman of whom we have already spoken. He appointed Frenchmen as custodians of the castles of Dumbarton, Dunbar and Garvie, the prime fortresses of Scotland. This was seen as an insult. And not content with this insult to the nobility and to the race and to the memory of so great a man and his brothers, he placed de la Beauté in charge of Lothian the chief region in Scotland, with the fortress of Dunbar as his residence, together

with the middle and eastern Borders of the Merse and Teviotdale, which were the special charge of the Humes - even the Hume estate which he held with his own garrison of Frenchmen, as if sitting on the neck of that family. From there he threatened the region, viewing it as if from a watchtower and in the manner of a triumph kept emphasising the murder of the chief of the family. He taunted them as men sent under the yoke. David Hume of Wedderburn could not help but see this daily set before his eyes and since he was nearest by natural ties of blood, place and position he was obliged to become involved. This man of spirit was tortured by the slaughter of his kinsman, ruin and proscription of his family, the ruin of his race, his own and everyone else's peril being likely to suffer the same fate whenever the Frenchman wished. These were the private reasons for hatred, public reasons were added. People complained of servitude under a foreigner saying their chiefs had become a laughing stock, that the Scottish race was worthless in the eyes of the French because it went so easily under the yoke by abjectly obeying a foreigner. And the ordinary common people complained that courage had failed, their nobility was degenerate and they were a cowardly race: first because such a man was placed over them and secondly because they accepted his orders. Liberty was lost and no vindicator existed. Their anger was increased when it was revealed that he had written to



France that there was no need for the Regent to return since he could transact everything at the nod from France. The result was that the Regent had less influence at court, as his support was no longer needed. But in general people only complained but didn't do anything. No one applied his hand to the task, with each waiting for the other as generally happens, until an opportunity, not so much sought as offered by chance, caused David to take it up and act on it. There was a Merseman Cockburn of Langton who when he died had left in his will as executors for his orphaned son, Cockburn of Clerkington in Lothian and Chirnside of Nisbet in the Merse, thus passing over his brother William. William had married David's sister, Swinton's widow. A fierce man he was indignant at his exclusion running contrary to ancestral custom which assigned that duty to the next of kin. So encouraged by his brother in law David who remained in nearby Polwarth with his widowed mother, William laid seige to the Langton stronghold which the executors had possessed. When de la Beauté heard of this, for by chance he was holding court at Kelso, he was enraged because this reflected on his own authority. Therefore he issued a letter to David to meet him. David refused to go without the assurance of a free pass. De la Beauté did not delay and sent it in full and as he was about to set out for Dunbar advised him to meet him en route the following day. Accordingly Wedderburn met him



one or two miles out of Kelso. He was courteously received with peaceful and friendly countenance. When they came to the matter of Langton, de la Beauté advised him to get his brothers and kinsmen to desist as it was setting a very bad example, and if they thought William had been injured in any way it should be tested by law not violence. In reply David carefully absolved himself, saying the matter was no concern of his, but indeed an injury seemed to have been done to William, as he was being kept from the management of his orphaned nephew. He said that had come about more by the treachery of the executors than his brother's wishes since on account of his illness he was not himself. But he said it did not concern de la Beauté as neither was William or his brothers his dependants but if they had done wrong they should be summoned to give an account of themselves. At this point de la Beauté began to kindle with rage and stated he had been given an order. He, on the other hand, said they were independent of him: he did not live with them, but with his mother, and he was not obliged by any law, or the actions of others to take action on their behalf. After this exchange of quarrelsome remarks de la Beauté, impotent with rage, with threatening voice and countenance, said he was giving him full authority to lift the siege, and if he didn't do it he would do it himself and bring them all to order. At that David said he had authority to return home and that's what he would

do. He would please himself. With these words he stood in thought until the whole column had passed. He took mental note of the threats and the likely outcome. If de la Beauté got to Dunbar he could raise an army from the whole country and hurry back. He was indignant that a foreigner of uncertain origin and rank had so insulted him and treated him as a servant. There kept coming to his mind the memory of the slaughter of his kinsman, Alexander, and his place taken by unfair means, the ruin of so famous a family, the great dishonour of his country, of his race and of himself because, they were as slaves. After he had thought everything over, inflamed not so much with old sorrow as with recent anger, he decided to take advantage of the present situation, an opportunity not to be missed. They had now come to a clump of gorse which lies to the north of the little village of Foggo across the stream from which it takes its name, and distant by one and a half miles at most from the Langton stronghold which William Cockburn and David's brother were attacking most vigorously. Therefore, sending ahead a messenger to relate the whole affair he ordered them to present themselves forthwith. He then advised his own men to mount their best horses and leap about with as much noise and tumult as they could muster, and to draw their swords as if to attack the column. This is the Border custom of either terrorising the enemy or causing alarm as to their

intentions and if any suitable opportunity for waging war presents itself, they use it. At the same time as they are hindering the enemy and throwing it into confusion they are warning their friends to come to their assistance. And they didn't carry out these orders in a slothful manner. They leapt down from the smaller horses they had been riding, mounted the better horses; drew their swords, and with as much noise as possible, repeating the name Wedderburn, did their best to instil terror in their enemies. There were no more than 18 horsemen, friends only who had accompanied him, with his retainers still unaware, who on hearing the tumult he did not doubt would rush up enthusiastically. In de la Beauté's retinue there were 500 horsemen or more, not only French but also Scots from Teviotdale and the Merse, who were either there on their own account or were in the company to do him honour. There were even some of the Lothian youth along with him and those who came from the Merse, when they saw the situation, some openly changed sides, others melted away home. Those from Teviotdale crept away. Only one lingered, Mark Kerr of Littledean who, seizing David's reins, kept pleading that he do nothing further against de la Beauté as it would dishonour him since he was his attendant. But when he saw David was fixed in his purpose and threatening with his sword to let go the rein, he let it go and forthwith joined those departing for Teviotdale. When de la Beauté

saw this he, wheedling, called David over: he apologised for speaking so highhandedly, pleading anger as his excuse. He had spoken too hastily and falsely and regretted what he had said and asked him to forget it, that they could reach some agreement. But to no purpose, because David believed he had gone too far for a safe retraction. Accordingly he pressed ahead by casting in his teeth the slaughter of his chief. Then the Frenchman, seeing the Scots slipping away, being left only with the French and the number of the opposition increasing, since there was no other hope, took to flight. He rode a very swift horse which had belonged to Alexander Hume and on which, if it had been saddled in the Scots manner, it is thought he would have escaped. But burdened with a caparison of great weight and unaccustomed to the French curbs with jagged points, it could not travel at speed. He sprang forward and since the road between Langton and Duns lay through a marshland (called Corniford) equidistant from both places, this he crossed before those coming from Langton could stop him. From there he went on through the middle of Duns with the rest following at some distance. A certain Dickson (or as others say Trotter), one of David's pages had sped to the conflict from Wedderburn on a horse which had been left behind and was not saddled. He was not far behind him and threatened him with drawn sword mile by mile. De la Beauté threateningly bidding the boy give ground fled

speedily until he came to a stony field between Duns and the village of Preston. There, while he was paying more attention to his pursuer than his path, his horse, striking its foot on a rock, fell. However, getting to his feet he defended himself fiercely from the young man until John and Patrick Hume arriving on the scene, slew him. His head was cut off and set on a public place in Duns on view for some time. Then they took it to Hume castle from where it was recovered. The body was buried where he fell, which now has the name of, and is pointed out by those who live nearby, as de la Beauté's grave. Historians relate that this killing occurred on 20th September 1517 and make the slaying of Alexander 11th October, whether through carelessness of the writers or the printers we can not discover. John Leslie bishop of Ross, for whatever reason, fabricated an account of treachery certainly ineptly for those who are knowledgeable of affairs in that region. It is known to all that David was braver than cunning and it is well enough agreed among the people of our region that the action took place just as we have described it, having heard about it from those who were present at the action. And it was not planned but happened by chance. Nothing, I say, was done with malice aforethought: the action was taken on the spot. So there was no point in the Council of Regency taking George Douglas the brother of Angus, into custody as if under suspicion of involvement. There



was no reason to suspect him, other than the fact that David was married to his sister. For the same reason they could commit Angus himself. Meanwhile David attacked Hume Castle and since it was not well enough equipped to withstand siege, the French surrendered. David's next concern was for the family, if it could be restored in any way. After the execution of the brothers Alexander, William and David courageous and wise men, the eldest survivor was George. On account of a previous murder some time before, he had gone off to England, and was lying low as the guest of the Dacres. David, therefore, went to him and advised him to return to his native land and take possession of his patrimony and dignity. He, of somewhat slower intellect, weary and terrified by the fate of his brothers, and having had an easy life for some years, refused. David then arranged with Dacre to bring him to an open field on a prearranged day. A second time David made the request: a second time he refused. Therefore, David seized his reins and led him, though unwilling and reluctant, back to Scotland and set him in his Hume estate. But it did not seem as if the house had returned to its former splendour. Alexander had left a daughter who was heir to the lands which were not male feus. If this was deducted the dignity of the family would seem too little, so he put George in possession of all indiscriminately. He claimed that the little girl had died after falling sick, and



with great ceremony he buried a small coffin. But it was full of sand and he sent the girl to Dacre to be educated. When she was grown up he persuaded her to relinquish to her uncle the old Hume lands, she herself being content with Samuelston which had belonged to her grandmother Kerr. But all this happened some time later. Meanwhile he advised the recently returned George to marry a Haliburton, one of the heirs of Dirleton, of whose disposal in marriage Alexander had the right: one he had covenanted to William and a second to Andrew Kerr. The house was restored though not to its previous pinnacle of greatness, none the less to its rightful place and private glory by David. Our writers describe these facts as happening at the same time as the murder of de la Beauté. I would rather relate them to the time when after the slaying of Blackadder, David recovered the Wedderburn castle along with that of the Humes. For the reason that these properties were handed over to Arran, which I think could not have taken place before George returned to his native land, for it is not likely that he returned to England and David could not have kept for him those possessions from which he had departed. For when the government had assembled, although the deed had delighted everyone insomuch as a foreigner and a rival who had been placed over them had been removed, nonetheless, in order to reject the deed as a matter of public conscience and to prevent a greater disturbance

arising, they chose Arran as Chief Justice, called a parliament for 19th February to which David and his brothers and William Cockburn were cited, and declared themselves against public enemies. They gave Arran a considerable army to pursue them. Well girt with that and also bringing large siege engines to reduce the strongholds Arran went to Lauder. To him David sent the keys of Wedderburn, Hume and Langton and Arran set a garrison in each. When Arran returned to Edinburgh, David withdrew to Edington, the Bassie stronghold, which was well fortified on the left bank of the river Whiteadder and touching on Berwick land. Since the lord, who had married a sister of David, did not give it up, David took it by force and advancing no further dwelt there throughout the time of his exile with no less interference than when he was at home; with practically no one refusing his authority and no one, unless on his instruction or indicating the reason for their journey having obtained his permission, going out of the district to Edinburgh. Robert Blackadder, prior of Coldingham in accordance with the enmity both ancient and recent concerning the patrimony of Blackadder, openly hostile, opposed himself to everything he did. When, by chance, they clashed during a hunt with equal numbers on both sides they fought with such violence and persistence with no one deserting his leader, the greatest number possible was wounded on Wedderburn's side and the other side along

with their leader were all killed in a total massacre. Holinshed says this action took place at Lamberton, others Harcrag - some rocks beside the river Eye. After that no one dared oppose him. He then applied himself to recovering those strongholds he had given up: in the first instance his own castle of Wedderburn and in the following method. When a number of the guards had gone to market in Duns he attacked them unexpectedly and took them captive to Wedderburn and showed them to those who remained within, threatening death to both those he held captive and those within if they did not hand over the castle immediately. Since they were somewhat stubborn, he ordered gallows to be erected and while they were being led to them, a certain Frenchman called Jean the small, a corruption of the French for elegant, skilled in ballistics addressed him, stating their death would be no advantage to him and he would hand over the castle to him provided they were given quarter. Then with permission he told the guards within to hand over the castle to his master, that they were wasting their time resisting as he knew how many and who were inside and how short they were of provisions which would last only a few days. When they were not persuaded he stopped talking and, released from his bonds, because he had previously been tied to Simon Penangus to prevent him escaping, he catapulted one of them over. Since there was no hope and their food supply was low, they surrendered the castle the following

day and were sent away unharmed. Jean remained with David and often aided him. Then they went to Hume castle which they recovered in similar fashion with Jean's efforts. Thence to Langton which was also surrendered. And so all of them were recovered as before. David took them and the whole region was brought under control with no one resisting. Then, as I think, he brought back George and performed the other matters mentioned above. He resumed friendship with the Douglasses thinking that to be in the interest of both parties. He gave aid when required and was always helped by them, particularly after helping William, Angus's brother to the priory of Coldingham to the exclusion of Patrick Blackadder who had claimed it for himself. There are those who say he got the benefice from the Pope with the Regent's consent. How true this is I do not know, for it is generally agreed that it did not come into his possession either from Pope or Regent throughout the five year period after his cousin's death. Whether he had no right to it, or on account of the well-known emnity of the Humes he had deemed it unsafe to come into the region, historians claim that at the time when Angus expelled the earl of Arran and others of his faction, David came to the gates of Edinburgh with William and 800 horsemen and forced the city gates. But the battle was already over, won by Angus on 30th April 1520. David saw to it that the heads of his kinsmen were taken down and

given honourable burial. The Regent had not yet returned from France and who would have believed that he would not return in anger at what David had done to lessen his authority viz. the killing of de la Beauté and Blackadder; the recovery of the strongholds in the Merse and the priory of Coldingham where, if historians write the truth, Patrick depended on his influence; he had been seen to invade the city for a purpose - the taking down of the heads of the Hume brothers and the public and honourable burial of these men as if innocent. But the Regent decided to do nothing against him and immediately on his return in 1522 he pardoned by name Patrick, John, Alexander and John the uncle. It comes to mind to wonder why Patrick should be named before John and Alexander since he was actually younger. Perhaps it was he who struck the blow. Besides the letter which we have already said was sent by de la Beauté to the French court, the reason for the Regent's leniency was that while David enjoyed so much authority in the Borders, he saw that he could be of use to him and not much could be attempted without him. It was not expedient at such a time to alienate or offend such a man, and drive him to the other side when he, as Regent, was about to lead an army into England. Nor did David as a brave and warlike man, ready to fight for his native land against England, disappoint his expectation. For at the siege of Wark when the leaders refused to cross the river, David

crossed with his men, caused the enemy to suffer losses far and wide and laid siege to the entrance to the castle. One day, in the sight of the whole army, the fighting taking place in a valley close to the castle, he fought with the enemy in such a way that he won the praise of all. This indeed was characteristic of him and bred in him, that he should burn fiercely with love of country and hatred of his enemies to such an extent that neither by exile nor proscription nor any misfortune nor fear on his part or by injury at the hands of his enemies could he be induced either to give himself up to the English or plead with them or take refuge in exile with them. Throughout the whole period of his forfeiture he never went to England nor used their aid, excepting that of Selby alone with whom there was a private friendship. Even so only on that one occasion when Selby, being in his company in that chance encounter with Blackadder, refused to desert him. And when Surrey led his army into Scotland when the majority of the Merse, Chirnside, Langton and others had gone over to the opposition and sworn allegiance to them to save their own homes from fire and destruction, David could not be induced by any means to do likewise. The army was directed to tear down his castle. It was situated on level ground fortified not so much by nature as by art, with a ditch 40' wide and 9' deep, with the wall not particularly thick but seven sided with a tower at each angle. Each



tower was round except the one above the door, and fortified, each with two horsemen a piece deployed as sentinels. But in the middle of the courtyard was a huge tower built of square hewn stone with a wall 16' thick and with seven arches and seven storeys above one another. There was a drawbridge before the gate which was the sole means of entry. Each tower was closed off by double doors, one of which was of very strong oak, the other of iron with a rope to let it up or down at will. With these fortifications it seemed safe enough against sudden attacks but when larger siege engines were moved up and it was bombarded with stones for a time, it had to surrender. When gunpowder was put in the foundations of the central tower, it was blown to pieces. Only a fragment stands to this day, which is some indication of the size of the operation. The exterior wall was left standing, though severely shaken and breached in places. The cracks were such that with, as I imagine, the foundations subsiding, or the sides inclining inwards, the walls almost came together after several years. Such as it was, it remained the owner's dwelling place after the English withdrew. More than that, the very rubble remained to be seen, an outstanding and honourable memorial to his loyalty to his country and a pleasing spectacle for his descendants of the same name up to the time of the third George his grandson. It is reported the strongholds of his brother John (of Blackadder) and

of Nisbet, one of his friends, and of his namesake of Polwarth, now called Redbraes, suffered the same fate. That belonging to Ayton had previously been destroyed when James IV was alive, yet the one at Duns, although shattered by gunpowder, still stood. An English garrison was placed in Hume castle. All the other castles surrendered to the English and their owners became tributaries. When the enemy retreated, David, a free man, returned to the remains such as they were and continued the war at every opportunity. He did not make any unfair peace, rather he expended himself totally, giving his life for his country. For, a year or two later, in a chance conflict he was captured by the enemy. While he was being led away, the aforementioned Selby secretly informed him that the horse on which he had been placed was very swift, if he could elude his captors. Since he was only casually watched, he managed to get away and had covered two miles with the English in pursuit when he decided to lighten the horse by removing the saddle. Borderers can do this easily even with the horse at full gallop. He had almost completed this manoeuvre when the horse, whether with the weight of him inclining, or its legs being entrammelled with the loosened girths, stumbled and threw him on to his head. With this fall and bleeding from wounds he died in the hands of his captors. The place where it happened, between Ranrig and Swinton called Towie is well known,

and a cairn erected as a memorial of the event, stood for a long time. Thus did he live and die, a man remarkable in mind and body, in love of country, in charity to friends and dependants and equally concerned about his kin and his chief. For the family of Hume owed its restoration to him, because if he had not come to its aid and made it flourish again it would have remained where it had fallen. Wherefore we have done him honour according to his merits:-

While de la Beauté a foreigner was imposing the foreign yoke of slavery, and the commons and nobility were raging at that, and at the loss of glory, and the race becoming worthless and that courage and spirit was no more, puffed up with his retinue and vomiting anger and threats he came. The battle was small in terms of the numbers involved, great in terms of the force I routed and conquered. I expiated slaughter with that slaughter and expiated your ghost great Hume. O my country what do you owe to me, what do you think the house of Hume owes to me. It is not for me to say.

To be sure he could never be repaid, nor could life be repaid, nor such sincere efforts. He was an example to posterity and his descendants. He left three male children: George, David and John and the same number of daughters: Juliana who married Gordon of Lochinvar in Galloway, Isabell who married Robert Kerr of Ancrum from whom descended the celebrated companion of Prince Charles and who was so well treated by him; Elizabeth who married Patrick Nisbet. I believe there was a fourth who went into a convent. His wife survived him, widowed a second time. She brought up the children and increased her

son's patrimony by adding to it the barony of Hilton. So upright was she, that she was more famous for her behaviour than her rank. James V, although implacable to her brothers having exiled them, and having burned her sister of Glamis, covered in calumny and not able to stand any of the race of Douglas or their kin or dependants, had taken her son George into custody. Nevertheless, as often as she went to plead on her son's behalf, or other business, he received her honourably, listened to her and although he refused to free her son, dismissed her affectionately. The religion she was brought up in belonged more to the Roman ritual, but, disturbed by the conspicuous falsehood of the begging brothers, she became disenchanted. She had been accustomed to treat these men generously and one of them, hoping to win her favour, had told the common people that she was a devoted worshipper of the Blessed Virgin, and that one day at the beginning of Lent when she opened an oyster shell she found an image of Mary enclosed in the shell. When this was reported to her she was so displeased, that henceforth she never allowed any of the order into her sight and held their religion suspect as depending on falsehoods. On her deathbed when the crucifix was given her to kiss, she turned away her head, saying that her faith did not depend on such trifles, that she placed her trust in Christ alone, her certain Saviour. About her this poem:-

Both in race and beauty and piety second to none, do you wish also to know what great virtue I possessed? The royal power which exiled my brothers and burned my sister revered my virtue. And because he excuses the fact that my son was confined to prison, does he thus make himself accused. Let them grant to others anything you like. I no longer feel any anger. There are more shining memorials of my virtue.

### George the Second

George his eldest son, a boy of about 9 years of age, succeeded him. Alexander of Manderston, the next brother, undertook the guardianship of the boy, assisted as far as possible by the other brothers. Therefore, when George the chief laid claim to the tithes of Keller he warned Alexander not to interfere. These tithes were farmed out from the Prior of Coldingham in whose gift they were and David and his ancestors had possessed them for several years. It is difficult to understand what drove George to lay claim to them. Whether on his own initiative, or because the estate was his and so the tithes should also belong to him, or at the instigation of another is difficult to say. Nevertheless, it is agreed he received the news of his kinsman's death with an ill grace. He turned to his friends and said "Is my kinsman dead? He has at last left me the Merse". His wife angrily replied, "Devil take you. Is this how you thank that man for his many benefactions, who brought you back from exile, hesitant and almost unwilling, and restored to you your patrimony and the lordship of Hume which you would never have got any other way? Are you



rejoicing and exulting in his death?" However Alexander hearing of this plan hastened to collect the tithes and took them to Wedderburn. Learning of this, George collected as big a force as he could, with wagons and other vehicles for transporting crops, in order to carry them off. But Alexander and John Blackadder and the rest of the brothers who had also assembled their dependants and retinues in the neighbourhood and had them in the castle, made a sortie. They killed one or two of their adversaries, scattered the rest and put them to flight, captured George and took him with all honours to the castle and entertained him lavishly for several days, then took him home, mildly rebuking him that this injury had been done to their ward, begged him not to listen to evildoers and that he had tested the spirit and zeal both of themselves and their dead brother. George, they said, was their chief and head of the clan, and their kinsman and they would attend him with all honour as far as they could. This is the most memorable thing that happened in his boyhood. On becoming a man he was imprisoned by the king at Blackness and kept there for a considerable time, although he had committed no crime and the king was not ill disposed to him. It was so that he might not, as a nephew, plot anything in the Borders on behalf of his uncles the earl of Angus and George Douglas who were still in exile and that was the reason the king gave the mother and excuse he gave the uncles around him.



Patrick one of the court he was on very friendly terms with and used to take him as his sole companion when he went, as was his wont, on his nocturnal excursions. The king even pissed on his legging in jest and he pushing him back said he was a worthless king. Even when the king jokingly threatened to strangle his nephew Wedderburn he replied, "Strangle me along with him and his uncles and we will stab you". A short time before his death the king relaxed his anger against the Douglasses, particularly after the Falla expedition, and seeing that the nobility was somewhat slothful, he thought the help of the Douglasses would be an advantage. He released Wedderburn from custody and presented him with an exceptional horse which George rode, and although a huge heavy man weighed down by armour he outstripped those who were unarmed and free of any restraint. The horse was called the White Carse and had been given the king by Carse Monteith. While he was at Blackness he begat by the governor's daughter, a son David called the White on account of the whiteness of his face and hair. When he was released he married Joanna Hepburn daughter of Waughton in Lothian and settled the lawsuit there was with that family concerning Thirlestane and got possession of the farm. John Hepburn, Patrick's brother had married Sybil Wallace and had received the farm for 19 years to use and enjoy for the annual payment of £20, from William Wallace of Craigie. Because of this, enmity

arose with the family of Wedderburn which was settled in this way. By her he begot a son and two daughters. The son died before his father, the daughters some while after. He especially loved his mother's brother and assisted him, even against his chief, George Hume, at Cockburnspath. He followed his uncle similarly at Musselburgh and was killed in the front line. After a lengthy search among the corpses, he was at length found, having died from many wounds to his front - proof of his courage. His retainers lay nearby which was proof of their loyalty. He was carried off to Dunglass and buried there. About him the following poem:-

As your witness most worthy uncle I entered harsh  
 battle under your banner I met my death in the first  
 flower of youth. I hoped to be no less a man than my  
 exiled ancestors. But life forbade and death  
 forestalled. What does it matter if it comes early  
 Spare your tears O parent behold a not unworthy  
 husband and father."

His wife survived him, an arrogant woman and in the time of the governor of Redcastle or if you prefer Castle Herald married John Hamilton of Cumnock whom she later had murdered by brigands.

#### David the fifth

George was succeeded by his brother David who had been saved by him from destruction at Musselburgh. For when he was about to proceed to that battle he was told by George to go back and stay with the people of the Merse. It was enough for himself to go and face the hazard of

war from the one family. When things looked black he took refuge in Dalkeith castle, which the following day was surrendered by James Douglas of Morton, who many years later became Regent. He then fell into the hands of the English and was taken to England and courteously entertained at the home of John Allarton where he remained for two years until the price of his ransom be paid. This was done with great difficulty, what with lack of money and his property being spoiled by war. The ransom paid, he at length returned home. He was a man above all dutiful and very upright, of the old faith, morally pure and frank and not ignorant of letters in relation to his rank, as education at that time was not considered necessary among the upper ranks - even now it is not so deemed by them. He had a knowledge of the Latin language beyond others of his name who studied arms alone, even as they do today. Yet I see some studied and continued to a master's degree - two by name: Andrew, brother of David the fourth, this man's uncle, and John uncle of David the fourth and brother of David the third. Alexander of Manderston too was considered so skilful in law that he understood his own affairs and was able to conduct them himself in accordance with the law. These facts suffice to prove that their intellects were not inept and they did not completely despise learning. David seems to have attended the Academy and studied logic which is evident from an anecdote told about him

and a certain fellow pupil (called Montgomery). In an argument when his opponent had denied a fact which he hadn't expected him to deny and there was no argument by which he might prove his point, he struck him a blow and said "Do you deny this?" The matter became proverbial and in the schools was called Montgomery's proof. Psalms, and quotations from them, he always had in his mouth. That especially which stated that all hope should be placed in God alone and 'It is better to place your faith in God than princes'. He particularly delighted in Psalm 146 and walking up and down used to sing it softly, accompanying himself on the lyre. With the greatest feeling he clung to ancient standards of integrity and justice and was utterly opposed to guile and trickery entertaining it in no way. I remember when a conversation had arisen among friends about prudence and trickery. His brother George had said by chance that a good thing could proceed to a good end by indirect means, and that sometimes it was necessary. He intervened and fiercely rebuked him, saying, 'What you call an indirect way, George, is but trickery and deceit and no way to be countenanced by a good man'. He himself was so keen for justice, so little covetous of another's goods, that in the midst of civil war, when Alexander the chief was forfeit, having defaulted to the Queen's side and he could have got the entire estate and in particular Coldingham priory which had belonged to

John Maitland, he wished not to lay hands on that or any other property. Well known proof of it is the conversation that took place between him and Patrick Lindsay: Lindsay, bidding him ask something from the Regent saying he could get whatever he wanted, he replied he would ask for nothing: he was content with his own. When Lindsay insisted, he said, "I shall make a request as you wish but it is certain I shall not be refused. I will ask him to give me the Priory of Haddington". The other replied "This cannot be given because I got it long ago. Ask for something in earnest for unless you receive something of the enemy's goods we shall never believe you are sufficiently loyal to our side". Then David said "If I never prove my loyalty otherwise let whoever wants, be doubtful of it. I have lived so far content with my own I shall continue to do so, I do not need more". Led by this love of right he always abstained from every quarrel and indeed in the beginning of the civil war disturbances he followed the Queen, and when she abdicated he deserted her side as well. Accordingly at her summons he came to Dunbar in company with John Blackadder his uncle with quite a large band and was with her at Carberry, although Alexander the chief and his cousin James Morton were on the other side. When some of David's servants went rather far from their fellow soldiers to get water from a spring because it was the height of summer and were captured by the opposition and taken to Morton, when they



revealed who they were and where from Morton said "Return and report to your master in my name that if he were the man he ought to be, he alone could resolve these evils". He hinted this, I think, because David had come surrounded by a great band of retainers and companions and because his company were about the only help the Queen had (for it is generally the case that the Border nobility abounds in men, that of Lothian being strong in wealth rather than men). The others whether rustic or urban were almost unarmed and disorderly. Therefore, he indicated that David was a force to be reckoned with, whether he attempted something himself, or crossed over to him, or deserted the Queen and went home. Bothwell also perceived and feared that and brought it about that the Queen interrogate him as to whether he would do his duty to her on that day, truly and with a sincere attitude. He answered he would do his duty - had come with that intention and would not have come otherwise, that he recognised her as his prince and would act earnestly for his prince. He begged her not to have any doubts about his loyalty or think that he was behaving one way with his face and an other way in his heart. Blackadder made the same reply but angry that his loyalty was being questioned, and knowing that Bothwell was the instigator of the question, he turned to him and said "We will abide with our Princess as long as or longer than you and we will act as befits trusting subjects". And



so they continued with her until, when Bothwell fled, the Queen crossed over to the nobles party. He then returned home without a word to either Hume or Morton. After the Queen had abdicated and substituted her son, and named tutors for him and the whole matter decided by law and ratified by the estates, David with the same loyalty obeyed the King and his guardians. Accordingly he sent his retainers under the leadership of John, to fight with their chief Alexander at the battle of Langside. Throughout the entire war he was either in Edinburgh when requested or had his domestics and tributaries at Leith at Morton's court, all this at his own expense, getting not a halfpenny from the Treasury nor any of the goods belonging to the insurgents. Some served as paid soldiers e.g. David Hume, Blackadder's son, who was a cavalry officer, others anticipated the return routes of the enemy like Alexander of Manderston who got Coldinghame priory, to meet his war expenditure. Coldinknowles and Hutton shared the lands and possessions of their chief Alexander when he defected to the Queen's side. And these resources let them increase their power so that they could equal or surpass David. Already they behaved as his equals. Manderston especially kept a huge retinue and made a great display of his greatness with pomp and boastfulness. Also either on his own or with one or two companions, whatever he did was with the greatest ostentation. But though they won over and

gained fortune in other regions it was not the case in the Merse. For David's power was founded on an ancient family and the faithfulness of his retainers, and with this power they could not equal him although assisted by all these props and stays. The result was that when a council met to appoint a Warden of the East Marches to meet with the English commissioners and settle their mutual claims he seemed the appropriate choice. Accordingly they summoned him and the Regent and Morton made the offer. He did not refuse but said he would take a day to think about it, as he did not like to do anything rashly. Seizing this opportunity his enemies, of whom we have spoken, lied by saying that he wanted to ask his chief Alexander's permission. When the Regent heard that he gave the post to Coldinknowles. Wedderburn in indignation complained that he had been made a laughing stock and went home in high dudgeon. Yet he never attempted any form of vengeance, but never deigned to acknowledge Coldinknowles as Warden. Nor did he go to meetings or allow any of his people to honour him or show him respect. If any English complained about his retainers he investigated and settled it. If anything was to be gained from the English, he sought it in private, and the matter was settled in private. In other respects he bore calmly the injury in which Morton had participated. He was more seriously affected when interceding on behalf of his nephew William Kerr he had

no success. Kerr was a young man of great spirit and expectation, active, very courageous and knowledgeable in family and Border matters. Though he was a Ferniehurst, he held to the Douglasses, to whom he was connected through his mother. On his mother's advice and of his own free will he had left Ferniehurst and gone over to Morton's side, proving his loyalty and zeal on many occasions and held by him in high esteem. In order to relax from the toils of war he had headed for home. On the way he met up with John Moscrop, his father's lawyer. This man in order to preserve his property, rather than any loyalty, had remained in Edinburgh when the rest of the royal supporters had left. Not suitable for fighting or ready in council he had kept up legal actions to no purpose. Kerr suspecting no ill and secure in Morton's favour, took him with him to Jedburgh to renew old friendships. In Jedburgh certain of the Rutherford and Turnbull clan, thinking they could get some money for a ransom, held him captive, alleging he was a traitor and belonged to the other side. They would not let him go despite William's efforts and pleas, that he had come in good faith and it was a disgrace to him. And so taking this indignity very seriously Kerr took his complaint to Morton. But he got no satisfaction, either because Morton considered it of little importance, or because he refused to offend the Jedburghers. Therefore, William in anger, deciding to take his own vengeance afflicted

them sorely on several occasions with mutual hatred blazing forth. At length it came to the point that John Rutherford, a learned man who was in no way evil, but who was said to have struck William's mother with the pommel of a sword in response to an insult, was cut down, not by William but by his companions, with William not so much assisting as not impeding. For that reason William was driven into exile, his goods confiscated and his stronghold given into the keeping of his enemies. Yielding to the wrath of the Regent he went to England to John Heron. His parents stayed behind at Wedderburn and long enough after for the Regent's ire to be sated, David interceded on his behalf. The reply he got was, because of his kinship the stronghold had not been levelled, more could not be granted. However, his sister attacked the castle which was rather carelessly guarded, with the help of farmers who lived nearby. In the absence of some, she captured the few who were within, and sent them away unharmed, brought the stronghold under her control and kept it as long as she lived. When the Regent heard this, he just laughed. As William got no favours, David complained that the Rutherfords and Turnbells were being preferred, and all of the latter and some of the former were notorious brigands. Nonetheless, he brought William to court as much as possible not without Morton's knowledge but not with his approval. To be sure, he thought that their efforts were needed against

Ferniehurst since they were his neighbours in Teviotdale and did not wish to offend them. Indeed the Regent nearly brought David into alliance with them under the guise of a royal treaty whereby all those of the royal faction in the Merse and Teviotdale were, on his orders, to be of mutual assistance to him against anyone he chose. He gave David the chance to sign. But David smelled treachery and refused, and would have given others the chance of refusing had not Morton, fearing that very thing, got David to withdraw to an inner chamber whereby the others, not knowing what David had done, could not be influenced by him. Patrick Hume of Polwarth alone hesitated, pleading that he was being drawn into a treaty with people who had three days previously stolen Wedderburn's cattle and with whom he refused to act. He suggested that most of the Turnbulls and their associates were suspected of that crime. Yet he signed, not to cause displeasure, and others followed his example. After this Morton went to dinner and forgetting about David and asking where he was, ordered him to be summoned. When he asked him why he was not coming to dinner, David quickwittedly replied "Since I was put in custody by law I refused to leave unless freed by law". David was of such a disposition that he refused to inflict injury or take revenge when injury was inflicted on him. At some point his uncle George came to stay with him. George had a quarrel with his chief



Alexander over Cockburnspath. At the same time, as it happened, Alexander had come to Manderston about half a mile away. Manderston took him hunting in the morning, and as he was a man of violent disposition and a show-off he led him into Wedderburn's lands to show contempt for George and involve David. George took the matter calmly and wanted to ignore it, but David knew what was intended, and unable to tolerate it, ordered his servants to mount their horses, and taking George with him, he followed Alexander wherever he went, until he returned to Manderston house. Then riding right up to the door and going into the back garden he spent the day riding among the broom there until evening. Then having satisfied his honour he returned home. This same man suffered a conspiracy against him and repelled it bravely. The conspiracy was for no other reason than envy and he had done nothing to warrant it. Langton, Swinton, Billie, Blanerny, Cumledge and Easter and Wester Nesbit, Longformacus, Wedderlie and Redpath had drawn on to their side men from Lothian like Ormiston, Clerkington, Colston and Binston, in order to lessen David's influence, howsoever they could. Alexander of Manderston who, we said, was in high favour with Alexander the chief had approved the conspiracy and was even the instigator of it. He controlled all his chief's actions and suits to such an extent that he was dependent on him, and his retainers followed Manderston instead of him. The



conspiracy was commonly called the Black Band. The matter was so obvious that in the Border Assizes on matters of restitution, they took their opposing sides like battle lines. Blackadder and Coldinknowles alone supported Wedderburn, the others were either spectators or neutral. After this had happened several times, as they were returning home one day, seeing Manderston, some of Wedderburn's followers advised him not to suffer their arrogance any longer. Wedderburn and Blackadder, however, said they wouldn't stain their hands with their blood, that Manderston was but an insolent youth. He would grow up and realise the error of his ways. Whatever the Band were planning there was only one manifestation of it. Whether it was James Stewart prior of Coldingham or his wife that joined Manderston's side, they strove to get the tithes of Kella, the ancient possession of the Wedderburns, taken away from him. But in vain. It is agreed that Stewart abominated the matter as he was mild mannered and a man who held all the nobility of the region as his friends, and David in particular, with whom the feeling was mutual. Since he could not be made to offend him nor tolerate his wife's opportuning any longer, weary of the matter, he went to his brother James, the then Regent, who was getting together an expedition to the north and so he withdrew from them on pretext of joining the expedition. In his absence, his wife ordered the men of her faction to be

present on a certain day and to bring with them carts and sledges and other equipment suitable for transporting crops. This they did zealously. But Wedderburn, mustering about 500 horsemen, arrived there first and scattered his adversaries before they could unite. He smashed the carts, unhitched the pack animals and drove them off and routed the men who had arrived with Stewart's wife. She was said to be a Hepburn, sister of the old Bothwell. A few were beaten but no one wounded and there was such a panic inspired in all that they sought hiding places everywhere: some in the broom and others below the banks of the river, the rest where they could. John Edrington commonly called the liar because he usually reported news falsely, even hid in a poor woman's cupboard. Cringing with fear he was pulled out amid laughter. When the panic settled down and it was realised that no one was hurt, they seemed so ridiculous that the Hepburn woman as she was of a not unpleasant disposition and not unskilled in versifying described the whole affair jokingly in a poem. No other thing was attempted by the Band. Thus with prudence and moderation he gained praise from his adversaries. The matter ended when the Hepburn woman, for sake of appearances, collected the tithes and then gave them to David, who used them thereafter, just as before. She took them to Easter Nesbit who sent his servant George to Leith to winnow it and burned the chaff. This action can

be seen as testimony of how modestly the Humes used their power, undeservedly an object of envy and hatred to their adversaries, and if their character could be improved they would be the first to admit it. At this point it is worth mentioning how, when certain of the leading men had met together by chance, a remark was made about the Humes: one wanted them to become spices and another beans that they might devour them. At that one of the group said, "If we had as much strength, people would find us more troublesome neighbours". This was a remarkable confession from rivals who delight in human failings. I could not but mention this since it is appropriate, and so that you can both enjoy the knowledge and so that you in whom the greatest power is invested, may chastise the young if they transgress. This is the essence of good breeding. He was in no way lacking in courage, a quality deriving both from breeding and upbringing, as can be seen by the following incident. A dispute had arisen between him and Oselle a Frenchman. The Frenchman had made a sortie into England, by-passing David, and on his return was being hard pressed and his troops thrown into confusion, some fleeing, others on the point of flight. David from on high, realising that they were in enemy territory from the smoke, in tremendous haste armed his men as best he could, and rushed to their aid, arriving in the nick of time since the English were about to launch a terrible onslaught,

and those who had attacked first had been killed. David, having thrown into confusion and killed those nearest, and attacking the keenest, drove them back to their own people. He caused his men to stand fast, checked the attack and restored the spirits of his people to such an extent they made a disciplined and orderly withdrawal to safety. Oselle was greatly pleased and after that, attempted nothing in that quarter without consulting David. In that praiseworthy matter, although unbidden and ignored, he had been willing to rush to lend help about which is the following poem:

Swinton may relate how ready was the hand in war when he saw the Frenchman fleeing along with the Scots horsemen. He saw the enemy thrusting forward with delight and pressing the rear. Nor would flight be safe, and some may say it was all but over, so many men handed to death, and he barely escaping with his horse. But I am present, I cast myself and my spear-armed squadrons in the way, and I snatch every one from death and flight. If the civic crown was given as of old it would have come to me. Thus the Tweed does not see me unworthy of my kind nor England see me deserving to die by the sword. O my country, I have offered my life to you. Mars has preferred to be sparing and kindly peace keep me safe for my native land.

Certainly before his arrival they had fled in such terror that they would surely have perished, and some had ridden past Wedderburn castle and said it was not strong enough to withstand attack. There was also one Robert Hume, as Homer says of Achilles "swift of foot", Blackadder's bastard, a very brave, but at the same time very gentle man, remarkable for his deeds and most unusually boastful of them. At the beginning of a race

sometimes he and David were equal, sometimes in front up to 300 paces then he would fall back. David loved this man because of his courage, humanity and similar disposition and he took him hunting. They used to compete on foot or on horseback and David used to get very swift horses from wherever he could, sought out either in the north of Scotland or England by the efforts of the exiled Graham, who he kept in his home at his brother Lochinvar's behest. Sometimes he had eight or more horses ready for the contest. Nearly always his horse won and got the prize except when Robert won on a certain black horse which, as long as he lived, no one could match. He was also such a master of the art of riding that often, when he had been defeated on the last round, he would lay a double wager and end up the winner. It is related that David and Robert so often raced other horses it was difficult to say who won more often. One horse even died in a contest. I think it was David's. Often he went further afield to Haddington or Peebles, the former 18 miles distant, the latter 24 miles and stayed several days with a great retinue careless of the expense, which was then considered beneath the dignity of a noble. He had been brought up honourably and in a splendid house mainly to ride, throw the javelin even play dice and other trivial games. He cared well for his family and family business and entrusted domestic matters to his wife, or when without a wife, to his servants.



Accordingly, he neither increased nor decreased his patrimony. He handed it down to his son as he had received it. I would not count love of the house of Hume the least of his virtues. Alexander the chief while he prospered, had partly been alienated by the slanders of enemies alleging his house was acting as if the equal of his own and was trying to rival him, which he took to be a dishonour, and they invidiously reminded him of the battle of the Barns of Wedderburn where his father was captured. Partly because David cultivated his Douglas uncles, treating them with seemly regard, and partly, it is said, through hatred of his father's brother, Blackadder, whom David could not honourably desert, Hume chose the opposite faction to David and supported it along with Alexander of Manderston and his other retainers, thus giving evidence of a not very well disposed mind, in relation to what the house deserved. All of that David had borne quite patiently and had nevertheless shown him respect as head of the family, and paid every due. When the situation changed with Alexander going over to the Queen's party David never wished to put a finger on any part of his goods or lands. Even when he had been captured and taken to Leith, he approached him in friendly fashion, greeting him and consoled him and when asked, in order that he might enjoy freer custody, stood surety for him. Moreover, he interceded with Morton that they be reconciled, and



commended his friendship to him, but in vain. Alexander acted in a superior fashion because he was kin. But in his adversity Alexander realised that he alone was his friend, all the others fairweather friends. He realised it too late and it vexed him he had been undeservedly unfair to him, but if he survived he would make it up to him. He didn't give the other nobility a friendly glance. I consider it true friendship that is neither disrupted by injury or affected by adversity, or fails in any duty, neither flattering or deserting, and though variously provoked, suffers all things and bears the errors of friends with equanimity. We will see a similar example in George, David's son towards Alexander's son of the same name. David had two wives: Mary Johnston who bore him children and Margaret Kerr who had none. Mary Johnston was daughter of Andrew of Elphinstone in Lothian, quite wealthy, in his household but one he had raised by prudence, foresight and generosity to a magnificence beyond all others however wealthy so that they easily gave way to him. Also a thing previously unheard of, the wardenship of the mid Borders was assigned to him, although he was from a different part of the country. The most powerful and strongest men in the region could not easily perform this task, and yet when he came to live in Jedburgh by liberality, humanity and prudence he saw to it that no one had ever fulfilled that office better, and he became an object of affection both

to his fellow Scots and to the English. Although held in the highest honour and reverence universally, yet no more than a year after taking office he relinquished it, tired of the expense. That family sprang from Johnston of Annandale, for Johnston's brother Gilbert, who was dear to King James since he was his tutor and held by him in great honour, took as his wife the heiress of Elphinstone, and received from her willing father her inheritance in Lothian and would have received as well those lands beside the river Carron in the Carse and the town of the same name, if he had been willing to take the name Elphinstone. But because his own name was dear to him, he refused and her father then gave it to the Elphinstones who now have it. This man's son, also called Gilbert, fell in the battle beyond Haddington waged by William Douglas against Percy of Northumberland, although Buchanan refers to him as Alexander. His son was Adam whose son was Gilbert and his son Andrew. David married the fourth daughter. The two eldest daughters had been married, one to Cranston and the other to Farley Brady. He passed over the third, Elizabeth, because it was thought that being stouter, although prettier in other respects, she would be less able to bear children. But that proved wrong, for a little after marrying Andrew Kerr of Falside, she was the first to conceive and after being spurned, which she resented to the end of her days, she sent to tell him that she was

pregnant. Regarding Mary, however, I can only repeat what is said everywhere, that there never was a woman who could equal her in every female attribute with kindness to everyone and generosity to the poor when they asked for food and clothing. Often when she had nothing else to hand she would strip the clothes off her own children to give to the poor. She would dole out whole bushels of corn and sent even more to the deserving poor. That seemed too much to some and they say her husband was obliged to restrain her. But he allowed her her own way, saying he was more likely to be indigent than her. She attended him with the greatest love, to the extent of jealousy, more through excess of love than spite. The story is told that when her husband had gone to Ferniehurst and had stayed longer than she thought he should, the wellknown feelings between Ferniehurst's sister and her husband came to mind, feelings which had fallen short of marriage. (That sister later married Hay of Yester). She was seized with jealousy, mounted a horse, and with one or two companions sped to him. Her husband, distraught at her unexpected arrival, asked the reason angrily, although he could not really be angry with her and asked why she had done it. Just as suddenly he sent her back home. He returned the following day and gently upbraided her for her groundless suspicion, but it was undignified behaviour and warned her not to do it again. And he took care he should not

give cause. She was of a mild disposition, gentle and not easily offended. But rather stubborn, she did not easily forgive an offence. A certain man in order to ridicule her almsgiving, stealthily sent a quite rich person to her to pretend poverty. She took pity on him and gave him several bushels of wheat. When he came back, she did the same again. But the third time, whether warned by somebody or recognising him, she sensed a trick. Whereupon, angry at the man, and the one behind it, and that her generosity should be ridiculed, she was never willing to be appeased, and never allowed either of them into her sight again. It would be a long job, nay an impossible one, to describe all her acts of generosity and pity that are still talked about today. She was almost more loving of her husband's friends than her own and was no less loved by them. I never heard anyone that did not give her the highest praise beyond all women. I remember her own eldest sister saying that another sister had been no less able but had a more demanding household so had not the same opportunity for bounty and generosity. Like in mind and as illustrious, although in a more humble position by frugality and prudence she increased her estate in a few years to 3000 marks which was not a paltry sum. She only lived twelve years as his wife and set aside this money to be her daughter's dowry, which was the case. Regarding domestic matters she was painstaking and open handed

because she was in a noble family and this was her husband's attitude. Moderate in her appearance, she did not give a show of luxury, she was pious and imbued with the fear of God, which she instilled in her children. In short, she was upright in every way. The summation of her excellence was that she was called the Good and by those who survive from that age she was called the Good Mistress of Wedderburn although she had some remarkable predecessors and successors. She died in childbirth, struck in the side by a servant Simon Hamilton, who, while he was carrying on with a maid in the barn, warned that the mistress was coming, leapt down from a heap of hay, and not realising how near she was, struck her in the side with his foot. Thence followed a miscarriage and then death to everyone's great grief. This woman, famous in herself, was made even more so when David married Margaret Kerr the daughter of Linton and widow of Pringle of Whitbank. She was completely the opposite: niggardly to the point of stinginess loving her friends and neglecting her husband. He chose her because she was past child bearing and he thought she would be an impartial stepmother. But she brought everything to the advantage of the children of her former marriage, her husband's children she regarded as encumbrances. He had begot eight children of his first wife, male and female in equal number: George, David, James, John, Isabella, Margaret, Juliana and Johanna. He had previously

begotten two bastard daughters, one in England by the daughter of his patron Allarton, and the second called Beatrix, in Scotland where she also died. Before he married he begot a son Patrick who died of consumption at Wedderburn aged 50 - the first of that family to die a natural death, since the others had given their lives for the country. David wished to be buried at Duns along with his first wife because of his love for her, modestly refusing Dunglass where the rest of his family are buried. He was of an exceptional manly beauty, a complexion fair for a man, with yellow hair, he had an aquiline nose and modest expression. Tall, he was imposing rather than graceful with a charm you could both love and venerate. He was elegantly, not luxuriously, turned out but fitting, and utterly devoted to his children whom he would often rock up and down in his arms. One day, in anger at a beggar who had made her child cry, he threatened to send her away empty-handed because of it. In short, he was pious, upright, honest, a true friend and as we have said just and brave. Perhaps a vice caused by his upbringing, he was less attentive to business than he should have been. This was not by fault but virtue and greatness of spirit which makes the weakness even more honourable, having reached that golden state. I fear none who can argue that he was less. These are the people from whom I am happy to have been born, and my children likewise. I have written



tributes to both. About him:-

You most of all dearest sire deserve to be commemorated by me. O most distinguished and rare glory of our age whose piety ancient integrity and bounteous good faith and simplicity Astraea leaving heaven deigned to cherish on this earth. Teach the lateborn grandsons of your son to be so wise and willing to live by your example.

Thus I have wished to live and this very work a testimony to be handed down to posterity.

To Mary Johnston

Neither future or posthumous fame has lied in its claims as far as I am concerned. O hollow name. Seldom has any woman been a rival for my praise. Nor has present time or ancient time brought forth your equal. Chaste modest, truthful, upright, energetic, bountiful in mind and hand. In one word Good. Dear to rich and poor, more dear to me and your own dearest husband. These treasures and gifts of your dowry I have striven to pile up for my children. Search the female race you will find no beauty worthy of your mirror.

Nor is this said in vain because her maternal dowry was uprightness, which was the greatest dowry for any marriage. On her account Isabella and Johanna the eldest and the youngest, with greatest and least expectations were married. The former married John Haldane of Gleneagles in the Jerma region, the latter William Cockburn of Langton. Both were remarkable for their beauty and character but were equals rather than alike. The former, tall and of serious countenance and solemn disposition showed a certain majesty and those who beheld her respected her. The other affable, subdued and approachable was cheerful and good humoured, loving and loved by all. Both were pious, upright, prudent and

pleasing to their husbands' friends as well as their own and popular with the common people. Nor is it inappropriate to write what I have toiled over in their memory since they are now dead.

To Isabella:

If I had not been born a woman I would have been a most worthy man. That fate was suited to my genius. I was worthy even to be born a chief so great would the glory be for my race and family. Fortune was grudging but did not grudge that here was a chief and a man though of the weaker sex able to strive with men in prudence and majesty of countenance and with a mind equal to a chief's, but the shame uprightness and modesty of a pink countenance denoted the weaker sex. I would have been more than a chief if I had been a man, more like a prince among men.

To Johanna:

Your mother's rival in nature and countenance and praiseworthiness let that be your highest praise Johanna. What you propose for yourself and the path you follow you clearly show. O worthy of longer life. It is difficult to surpass what is right. Fame predicts you her equal and cherishes you mindful of your future.

Thus truly she was and like in genius. Whatever was praiseworthy about their mother they copied. Both left children, the former ten, the latter two. The former died in childbirth three years before her husband, the latter fell ill at the same time as her husband, and with the same illness, from which they both died, although she was in Langton and he in Edinburgh. They were buried together but not without the common suspicion of witchcraft.

To this woman and her husband:

Love, piety, probity, constancy and every virtue joined you together and the space of one hour joined you in the same bier. Together almost in the heavens. One hour bore you to the sepulchre while you received your fate. Deservedly the mob cursed the rumoured sorcery. Did God himself join you in heaven as he did in earth?

It was her prayer that she should not survive her husband which was the case. John Hume worked away at his studies to the detriment of his health and George the eldest succeeded about the age of 22.

### George the third

He was born at Elphinstone at his grandmother's house where she had brought her daughter when she was about to give birth to her first child. He was born immediately, born prematurely because of the journey. So weak was he that he was wrapped in black wool, yet it is remarkable that afterwards, he grew so quickly that, before his twelfth year, he was shown to the Queen Mother, widow of James V, as a miracle. In his 16th year his height did not increase, but his beard sprang forth as if he had reached manhood. He was educated first at Dunbar under William Lamb then under Andrew Simpson a most notable scholar and teacher, and because of such innate talent he became so proficient that he knew Latin above all. Both in prose and verse he wrote to the great praise of those who read it, and no one at that time was thought to equal him in any school in Scotland. He had learned the elements and rudiments at home with his parents. A

certain John Knox was his teacher and he had become familiar with scripture and imbibed piety both by precept and example. A notable action of his boyhood should be mentioned. When his mother received news of her father Elphinstone's death, she began to grieve so sorely that she could not be consoled and would not stop her tears. He, a lad of about eleven, who had been used to reading at her side, took the Bible as if to perform his daily task. Turning to Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians he opened it at the fourth chapter, which is about restraint of sorrow for the dead, and in a clear voice, read out loud. When he finished he closed the book and rushed outside without a word. She, as if consoled by that reading, dried her eyes and followed him out into the yard and mingling with the others, took food and thenceforth stopped weeping. A notable example both of prudent advice from one so young and of pious restraint in such family grief. He had been brought up by this same grandfather along with his cousin George Kerr, who although several months older he far excelled in intellect, strength and ability but was surpassed by him in music. Little more than a youth he was sent to Regent Morton at his request. Archibald, earl of Angus was there at the same time, to whom John Provan was given as teacher, who lectured him on the rudiments of logic and read with him John Rutherford's Compendium. He paid great attention to this man and learned from him. He did

not touch literature at all but of his own accord attempted French and was so successful he pronounced it reasonably, and understood it perfectly, and spoke it not badly. After that he began reading histories not only for pleasure and as a pastime as is commonly done, but in order to learn and become wiser. Geography was added and knowledge of places so that he himself who had never left his native land might vie with anyone who had spent time abroad in France or elsewhere and might surpass most men. He learned to use the triangle in measuring heights without being taught or from any book. Regarding the Holy Scriptures he ranged through them with the utmost diligence and was happy to debate, generally at table or over drink, when he questioned others and expressed his own opinion. He sought out the thoughts of the ancient philosophers and acquired them by disputation. As he possessed a very good memory, as soon as he heard something he retained it and applied it to his own use as if gained from reading, and, indeed, he kept reading whenever his public and private duties allowed. He also used to write and meditate upon the Apocalypse, the soul, love, the catechism; to please his wife he translated the mass into the vernacular so that its nonsense could be clearly seen. There were other matters in which we may see lack of judgement, care lacking, this we can regret. But it was the held opinion about nobility that letters were unbecoming, and so he was dragged away from



education when he could have become the greatest. Witty by nature, he was delighted by witty remarks, more so than I would have wished, and was indifferent to offence, whereby he gained the reputation of sagacity. I don't know if it ought to be gained that way. Sparing both in writing and speech he was a man of so few words that even his father complained that he had to guess the greater part of his letters. He was remarkable of any one of that age, and in that area, for the breadth of his knowledge in politics, economics, agriculture, cattle rearing and related matters. Knowledgeable of tradition and yet not ignorant of foreign ways, skilled in law he had touched on empirical medicine and quite happily advised those who consulted him. In short, you would recognise a mind suited not to one thing but to anything or everything. His perceptions were rather opinionated (so he was in his outlook). Accordingly, he thought this was the way to maintain authority and could not readily endure his arguments being destroyed or accept the opinions of others, though they were giving correct advice. When helped by someone, he pretended it hadn't happened. Prone to suspicion, he often complained about that in himself. He also acted in a domineering fashion with his brothers about which serious disputes often arose with me on behalf of the rest. Even with me, he urged too much the prerogative of age and hence authority which had no validity with me. Authority had to be won



and maintained by love alone. These things concerned his mind. As to his body it was of upright and square stature, his countenance when young was loveable and charming, he had decent legs innate strength and was among the first at running. His manners and behaviour were charming, and he sang in the fashion of the court. Also, from time to time, he sang and accompanied himself on the harp and danced without ostentation. He was keen to hunt hares with dogs and birds with falcons, of the small bodied, long winged species called merlins. He also used to catch partridge and moor fowl, the former thriving on stubble and the latter found in heathland. He indulged that sport so much that he had a shelter built in the Lammermuir hills where he spent the night. It was called Handaxwood after the neighbourhood. First he delighted in falcons but irritated and weary of the sloth of the falconers he changed from them to tercells and used them into his old age. With them he took exercise and learned their characteristics and haunts and ended up very knowledgeable of their flight paths. He was a skilful horseman and sometimes broke in the fiercer animals himself. He shot with the bow with the greatest expertise, equalled by few. He was also capable of enduring cold, hunger and thirst, and on watch, I remember him telling me he spent three days and nights without sleep. Moderate in food and drink and at times abstemious, this was not counted a virtue and is now so

rare. Once, when as a young man he had indulged too freely, he began a conversation with his friends that nobody would listen to. He thought he was being too talkative and so withdrew and went off to sleep. On waking he at once enquired of them what they had thought of him and when they said they were not aware of any fault he was pleased, yet that was a lesson to him for as long as he lived: to keep away from overindulgence and so have nothing to fear. Neither by word or look would he agree to drink although it is a duty of being at court. He was never coaxed, even in jest, and when challenged did not give in. On the contrary he opposed it and explained his opposition. When he was the king's paymaster, and at a banquet, they were drinking the king's health with greater hilarity than good sense either for the king or themselves. The duke of Leven standing bareheaded gave the toast with great ceremony. He too got to his feet and bareheaded put the cup down on the table. When they kept standing he asked why and was told "Until you drink that cup" He replied "You had better sit down, you'll have to wait too long". Leven did not laugh and sat down forthwith, knowing what he meant, and had the cup removed. We have said above that he lost his mother as a boy. He held his father in high regard and for his father's sake, honoured his stepmother and tried not to offend her in any way. But she was unfair to him and his brothers. Considering his

stepmother's temperament, he had inadvertantly made her hostile when he scorned marriage with her daughter, Margaret, now of marriageable age. Therefore she furnished everything in as niggardly a fashion as possible, either to render him willing through hardship, or to exact vengeance. Accordingly he was seldom at home and mainly at court with the Regent where he was neither casual nor idle. He either attended the Regent or with Angus was present at lectures and exercises. Sometimes he played chess because that game has more skill than luck and to avoid dice and cards which are common among courtiers. He was to these things quite inclined by nature and was often invited to play but since he was short of money, he could not play with his elders and equals, and shunning the younger set he preferred to abstain. He used this honourable excuse (this benefit originated from his stepmother's greed) that as he was kept short he had to practice frugality. He learned concern for his own property without meanness both willingly and by the example of the Regent. He also showed restraint or moderation in controlling his affections. Since Angus's sister was in the same house, an outstanding beauty and of noble birth, she was so pleasing to him that he fell passionately in love with her and wanted to make her his wife. She herself was not unwilling nor did it displease the Regent, or her brother, when he learned of it, yet he never asked her

because he was unsure of his position in relation to his harsh stepmother, which was not quite the same as when he was born. While he hesitated she married Maxwell. Not so much of her own freewill as on the authority of the Regent who did not want to miss that particular opportunity. However, George bitterly regretted this either because of his prudence or his remarkable love for her, as he used to tell me, or his laggardliness or whatever while his father was alive. But when he died he acquired enough wealth and the girl did not hesitate to complain and remind him of it. His father had not increased his patrimony nor had he diminished it or burdened it with debt, and when he died he left the previous years crops in the storehouses and granaries in bulk, and that year's ripened crops with autumn at hand, also herds of cattle and oxen of every kind. And nothing was to be settled on the other children, for the eldest sister received a dowry, as we said, left her by her mother but it was not counted part of the estate. David was proclaimed executor by his father along with George and through love of his brother, which was above all others at the time, and contempt for property and being reputedly devoted to learning, with the carelessness of age, and concerned only for what pleased him, when asked had refused and even refused that part of the goods which was returned so to speak to the heir. And he did not claim anything for himself and only wanted

to depend on George's judgement to whom he committed and entrusted everything. The other two brothers and two sisters followed his example. Therefore, since he saw that he could achieve it without too much difficulty, his first care was to restore his family to its former splendour and distinction from which it had declined through the meanness or baseness of his stepmother. Thinking it especially honourable to himself, and necessary for his reputation which is most important at the outset and important for maintaining authority in the Borders. And so he surrounded himself with quite a large retinue and maintained a troop of about 18 horsemen, each of whom had two horses and a foot attendant. Not far away lay the village of Kimmerhame with its twelve inhabitants or thereabouts accustomed from way back to this kind of service. They cherished their land no more than their horses and were accustomed to bearing arms. They seldom lowered themselves to rural work, never used their horses for this and kept them so sleek and swift that they vied with their lord and his servants. They were always ready for sudden orders to go or be led wherever they were required. The result was that he was surrounded by 20/30 horsemen, all fierce and warlike. Nor did expectation deceive him. This arrangement excited such a reputation for him among his feudatories and others and struck such fear in his rivals that they gave way immediately and did not dare



oppose him. That was first evident in the struggle with Coldinknowles. He was Warden of the East Marches, made thus by chance and deceit as we have already said. David, George's father, was taken in by him. This man having also a great reputation in the West Merse had excluded John Cranston of Thirlestane from the land of Rumleton, in favour of Bruntsfield the former owner and although he knew that Cranston had the right, the verdict of an Inquest and royal letter. Bruntsfield was ordered to give up the land on pain of treason. However, he retained possession, relying on Coldinknowles. George seized this opportunity to scupper him, and, mindful of his father's injury and ridicule, suggested to a not unwilling Cranston that he should give up his right to his son Thomas who was still a lad and he, George, would be his guardian. Using this title to vindicate his ward, he came in person with an armed band, and in his own name ordered the land to be seized, and then put the father in possession. Coldinknowles and his client Bruntsfield suffered it and did not threaten anyone from that day to this, and Thomas the son enjoys what he received from his father's hands in peace and tranquility to this day. Not long afterwards, in the eastern district George took issue with Alexander of Manderston, equally his father's rival and detractor. Alexander had taken possession of Coldingham priory, and wealthy from its ample revenues, and escorted by numerous servants and retainers, he moved



about as an object of fear to everybody. Alexander had lands on the banks of the Tweed in a village called Graden, a third of which land extended into George's territory. Nearby there was a salmon fishery in the river. In the course of a quarrel between their retainers Alexander's men, William Gardner and John Newton had wounded one of George's men, William Pollen and taken off to England. Alexander, hearing of this, escorted as usual, hurried to Graden, summoned Gardner and chastised him, ordering him to stay and get on with his business because he said no one dared create trouble for him. As it happened at that time, George was in Edinburgh and when he returned home and heard of this affair he enquired if Gardner was doing as he had been told and staying at home. He learned that he was not confident enough to come home to stay, but would come only if the coast was clear and didn't stay long. He took pains to learn where to find him. Everything ready he went bright and early to Graden and went to his house. As it happened, Gardner had gone to the field and, seeing the horsemen, and thinking he was being sought after, fled towards England. But seeing that his way was blocked by David, George's brother, and those who had been sent for that purpose, he changed his mind and took himself instead to a very elaborate house belonging to his patron and called Snuik. Barring the door he tried to defend himself. George arrived in hot pursuit and

since Gardner refused to come out, set fire to the doors. Gardner terrified by this gave himself up and was taken to the Wedderburn stronghold. As he was a confirmed enemy and a known thief, he would have paid the supreme penalty because of his patron but George's resolve was moderated. He allowed himself to be entreated by John Simpson, a loyal man and servant of George's boyhood and a relative of Gardner who interceded for him. With repeated supplications and promises he was sent away, after as much time had passed as was sufficient to show that nothing was being conceded through fear of his patron. The same clemency was not shown to William Grieve, Alexander's retainer, a known brigand, who relied on his patron's protection. George saw to it that he was arrested and taken before the Regent. He was condemned and paid the due penalty, though his patron bitterly resented it. In order to show how little protection was being sought, he used the law against his own people for at no point did he depart from the law nor did he allow them to do so. This pleased good people and frightened malefactors. But some may say that a rule of law which takes emotions into consideration is not justice. To be sure, he did this but only when the occasion arose, rather than seeking it out. Who can say which comes first. There was indeed a time when it would have been useful for one's reputation to envelope justice with emotion. But this is no longer the case and it has

come to the point when to gain the reputation of wisdom one must prefer justice to emotion. It gives great satisfaction to pursue justice for itself alone. To look after one's own affairs and avenge wrongs shows wisdom. When he saw to it that that man was punished rather than the guilty and condemned one here emotion was involved. So be it. But to have done violence to a villain is justice. Certainly one should aim at perfection but the instance of this one person should not be despised, rather praised. When later he held public office, he was impartial with friend and foe alike, but as a private person, he had exercised private justice in a particular fashion. But he was as one would expect, a man of the utmost moderation and levelheadedness together with prudence and wisdom. This only shows that he abhorred crime and bloodshed, was easily placated and not too anxious for vengeance. He had decided to build a mill on the Eye below Ayton, the work had reached completion with the canal cut and the dam constructed, and even some corn ground. And so it was against the law to divert water from where it had been channelled. There dwelt nearby James Crow of Gunsgreen and he had located a mill a little farther down, which was rendered useless by George's mill. When he saw that, he had just laughed and by night removed the stones and turves of George's dam which held back the water. But he did not do it secretly, so it was noticed. He was pointed out as the

culprit by general repute, since it was to his advantage alone. It seemed arrogant and unworthy of him to dare to do such a thing and if it were not avenged George's reputation would be affected, particularly at the outset. It was a known fact that a wrong ignored encouraged another, and there were those who urged him to kill the man as no other penalty was severe enough. His attitude was different, as with all savagery. To satisfy his honour and take care of the man's safety George sent his uncle John with selected horsemen to intercept him in the field and bring him to him. But because his uncle was somewhat hostile to Crow, as it concerned him, because George had generously granted the mill to him, and also violent by nature, George fearing he might threaten the man's life, sent his brother David with him to restrain him. George himself withdrew to Ayton castle to be present at the right time if the situation demanded. They spied the man in the field and hurried towards him, but before they could catch him he flung himself into Bastonriggs house, and barring the doors prepared to defend himself. John struggled against the door and he on the other side resisted. John decided to shoot him through the door with a small pistol but David dashed the gun from his hand. At last, begging only for his life, he was led by David to his brother unharmed, who asked only that he replace the stones he had removed and promise never to impede the mill further, and so Crow was

sent away. With acts like these George's authority had grown and his justice and moderation had both removed and roused envy. He increased the number of his vassals with the people of Girnielaw by collecting the tithes of the village which he leased again to the inhabitants, at almost the same price as he had purchased them, and so earned their goodwill and reputation for generosity. The result was he found them most ready for every service especially when during the minority of Alexander Hume the chief was forfeit for defecting to the Queen's side and the rights and privileges not yet restored to his son. His exceptional care in placing his sisters in marriage won him no less renown and good fortune, with the illustrious memory of their mother, their similar disposition and honest beauty winning love for them. Chance helped in the placing of Isabella the eldest. When John Haldane of Gleneagles or Vallaglisius went to Morton the Regent to transact his marriage and wardship business, since Morton as guardian of the king possessed this right, Morton stated that he would give up this right to Isabella and ordered him to go and tell her and let her decide. With Haldane were his two uncles and David Erskine, prior of Dryburgh. Without delay these men went to Wedderburn, saw her, known previously by repute and addressed her. She agreed. They discussed it with her brother and made a settlement, and a day was set for the wedding, and her brother decided how to give her



away honourably. And it took place in accordance with the dignity of both with splendour and pomp. This also increased his reputation, for he had the wherewithal to provide banquets as often as he wished. But if it is true that it is a mark of the same wisdom to draw up a formidable battle line against the enemy as it is to provide a superb banquet for friends, no one would have drawn up a better line. The marriage, however, although seen as happy chance, and not made by him but through the goodwill of the Regent nonetheless turned to his credit, on account of his attitude to his sister, the magnificence of the banquet and the generosity in the bride's apparel which was totally from him. All this received greatest applause. He intended Margaret the next, for Renton Billie and got him to agree, but she herself had made a promise of marriage to David Hume of Coldinghamlaw, since she feared her stepmother's stubbornness would restrict her expectations, and she could not be made to break her promise. At this point his goodwill, concern and prudence were praised, the rest was not his concern. The third daughter Juliana he gave in marriage to John Kerr of Littledean and gave a dowry of double the portion left by his father. The marriage was agreed with Walter, the young man's father, urging it. He had fierce disputes with the Humes of Manderston, Hutton and Coldinknowles. There were quarrels inherited from his father Andrew and concerned the lands and tithes



from Coldstream priory. When Kerr, with right on his side realised that he was unequal to the strength of the Humes, he also saw the great authority of George which could either persuade or compel them to justice. Since the girl was agreeable and the dowry not unacceptable, so that he might either join George or use him as an honourable intermediary of reconciliation, he pursued the alliance and obtained it. The rest, on the other hand, fearing that if the marriage should be compacted they would have George as a certain enemy, tried by every possible means to confound it - by offering seemingly fairer terms to Kerr; by secretly sending some mutual friends to raise doubts in George's mind and to argue there would be various disadvantages to the Hume clan from the discord which was bound to arise from it. They wheedled him with flattery and led him to hope that they would entrust themselves and all their goods to him. But no way did they dissuade him and even less so Kerr who knew what they were up to. Since devious remarks were unsuccessful they approached the matter directly. First of all Manderston openly sought a reconciliation using George Turnbull as his intermediary, the farmer of Wood at Wedderburn. He, an intimate friend of Alexander, reported that Alexander regretted the discord, blamed anger and partially admitted he had been wrong, that he was unhappy that what had occurred had happened, but the past was the past, what had been done could not be

undone, George was to him his prince, that he was sprung from the same family and stock not very far removed, and would consider it an honour, in fact he could pray for nothing more than to serve him, show his feelings for him and be of use to the family of Wedderburn. Thus he promised in suppliant fashion. In short there was nothing he would not promise in order to soften him. At length by constant attention, paying court, and repeated promises he drove him to the point where George agreed to speak to Alexander. This took place at Jedburgh where the Regent had come for the assizes, and instructed to attend, they assembled there. Alexander came to George's lodgings where, face to face, by repeated swearing and affirmation they made a pledge at first in private and the following day openly. After that he used to come every day to George's house sometimes waiting, sometimes entering, escorting him to the court and back, at no point leaving his side so long as they remained at Jedburgh. When they got back to the Merse with the same Turnbull as intermediary and face to face he asked George to renounce the marriage with Kerr. He said it would be to the advantage of the Hume name that the Kerr clan should not cross from Teviotdale to the Merse, that Walter was his determined enemy and there could not be friendship to both. In reply George calmly begged him to reconsider, that he could not lose the honourable chance of placing his sister, that there was no reason why he

should worry about their friendship, as he, George, knew the meaning of friendship and would not break it, and he would make sure that that alliance would not be a source of injury but of advantage to him (Manderston), that he had high hopes of young Kerr and did not despair of the old one, that everything would turn out for better, that there could not be a more honourable end to all the disputes and, as he hoped, it would be for the greater good of everyone. Since he gained nothing Alexander went off and took his friendship with him. George carried on with the marriage. But not forgetting his kin and eager for peace he altered the situation by coming between the factions with Kerr by granting much in his favour that was his so that all openly admitted they were satisfied. However, they secretly nurtured a grudge, as if the injured party because they had been cast down. And when the first opportunity arose it burst out. The marriage was dissolved because of Kerr's adultery. George, pleading his sister's case wanted to reclaim the dowry which was rightly hers, by force. But Alexander of Hutton refused to join him arguing it was not a clear cut case. After several years, when he himself was married, he placed his fourth sister, Joanna, with William Cockburn as he was courting and in love with her, and increased her dowry. Concerning his own marriage we have already said what he wanted and what prevented it. When he was over Angus's sister, he looked to her sister

Margaret Douglas the widow of Walter Scott of Buccleugh but desisted even from that on the advice of James Johnston his uncle. She afterwards married Francis Stewart of Bothwell. He had previously cast his eyes on Joanna Haldane sister of John of Gleneagles, the youngest of three who remained unmarried, a maiden of exceptional beauty, good natured and honourably and piously reared, by the great care of her mother, Lundie's daughter, but since he believed she was much loved by David, his brother, and that she in turn was not indifferent to him, he had refrained from pursuing the matter. There was indeed between her and David a mutual and honourable feeling but he was aware of the somewhat meagre possessions he had to offer, and felt there was little hope of making her an advantageous marriage. Therefore, when David guessed that she was well disposed to his brother and thinking it unfair to oppose both his brother's love and the maiden's advantage he decided to explain this to his brother. But he was distracted from his purpose partly by modesty and partly by doubt, that he was doing the right thing. At length when they were both at Gleneagles and George had returned leaving David with his sister, he realised that Edgar, a footman, had been left behind by George on a frivolous pretext but in fact to spy on himself. A few days later when he had returned home, George broached the subject and inquired searchingly, as to his feelings. He, knowing what he was

leading up to, in order to free him from groundless fears unhesitatingly admitted his love, but stated it was a pure love and the maiden if it pleased him was unbesmirched, honest, modest and pious. This was what he wanted to hear. Accordingly, sending a message to his sister, he himself followed on and settled the marriage. He refused the modest dowry which had been offered in favour of the sisters he had passed over. Several years later, with the same David as intermediary, he saw to the placing of the second of them Elizabeth with Philip Nisbet his neighbour in the Merse. David a short while after went off to France with his brother in law James Haldane, where he was kept quite generously for a time. Though the marriage was fitting, nevertheless, because it seemed beneath his station, it was received with mixed feelings. In particular it annoyed the Regent because he had not married into the leading nobility. However, he bound to himself the family of the earl of Mar from which the girl was descended and he in turn showed devotion to Mar. He eagerly seized the first opportunity of showing his goodwill and concern in the dispute Mar had against Graham, earl of Tarchia or Menteith and went to Edinburgh with him, attending him with a notable band of retainers, and not without some resentment on the part of the Regent. The ill-feeling between George and the Regent came about because the Regent had married his bastard son James to Anna Hume the heiress of Spott, and had procured

the whole patrimony of the father-in-law after his death for his son-in-law. Then came the desire to add to the same man the land of Thirlestane, a Wedderburn possession, because it was on the boundary. Therefore, without George's knowledge he bought it from Wallace of Craigie. Afterwards he summoned George and told him what he had done and asked him how he could best satisfy him. Without hesitation he said, "By giving up the farm to me". "But I have just bought it", said the Regent. "But", he replied "you have not acted correctly, considering the relationship we have and our loyalty and regard for the name of Douglas. You bought a farm which you knew I possessed, what is more handed down from generation to generation. No one in Scotland but you would have done this and you would not have done it had you not been Regent". When asked if there was any way it could be made up to him he said "Yes if you give it up to me for the exact sum you paid for it". And so they parted. But after asking him the same question as often as they met, and getting the same reply a public edict was issued as is the custom, warning him to leave the farm and take his belongings with him. If he did not do so, it would be considered an act of violence for which he would pay the penalty. George was at that time living at Wedderburn when the edict was made, but transferred himself and his family to Thirlestane. When he was summoned and did not appear, a decree was made



that he should depart on pain of treason. When he heard that, he began to build and added a parapet to the house which was quite small, but two storeys high. He was able to oppose the decree for one or two years. He still worked the land, preferring to pretend ignorance and test the Regent's attitude, knowing he would be restored to favour if the need arose. Meanwhile, there was a conspiracy among the nobility and the Regent was demitted from power. However, George hurried to him intending to share his destiny if Morton, having bargained for immunity, had not voluntarily given up office. After six months at Morton's request and with William Douglas interceding, the matter was so arranged that George was cautioned in regard to half the farm and ordered to give up the other half. About the time that Morton was summoned by Mar to attend the King, George set out for the parliament in Stirling. His only intention was to see Alexander Hume, young son of the deceased Alexander, restored to his full rights. When the nobles met in Edinburgh he got the agreement of Hutton, Coldinknowles and Manderston to send letters to that effect via himself and George Ayton. Soon after they changed their minds and asked for the letters back and tried to stop Ayton going, but George forbade him to return, strengthened Ayton in his wavering and took him with him to Stirling. There he brought Morton round to his opinion although unwillingly. He warned that it was not in George's best

interest; that the house of Hume their chief was seldom in harmony with his own and when it was removed his own house was in first place, but if restored, his would only be second. To which he replied that it was a matter of his own loyalty to the head of the family, that he could not anticipate events as they could not be foreseen. He was not hoping that when restored they would favour him because he had freed him but hoped to be well treated. He so handled the matter that with the support of the house of Mar which was very powerful at that time, he almost brought it about, even with Morton's objections. He also willingly undertook the Wardenship of the eastern border, taken from Coldinknowles because of the wrong done to his father, and managed it wisely during Alexander's boyhood. At that time, falling ill, he wrote to his brother in France and got Johnstone their uncle to write that he was in poor health, many burdens had fallen on him, that he was needed, that he had got the tithes of Darnie for his use and he should hurry and take his share of the burden, that it was his duty and to be put before private study. He also threatened to send him no more money. But these things were not necessary, he hurried back of his own free will, and although he was enthralled with the study of literature and having set out for Italy, reached Geneva, yet when the letter arrived he did not delay, although James Haldane was of the opposite opinion, stating he should wait for a second letter.

Stopping everything, he returned to his brother in his native land almost at the same time as Esmé soon to be made Duke of Lennox, sailed for Scotland which led to trouble for Morton: first prison, then execution, and extinction. These things could not happen without damaging George. By reason of the relationship with the Douglasses, as we have said, he was always a partner in the troubles of that house. Accordingly Archibald earl of Angus, time and again had called him to meetings and consulted him by letter, as a man whose loyalty and wisdom he trusted above all. Although careful enough, he did not entirely deceive the court from beginning to detect some rumours, even that he had been having frequent discussions with Archibald Douglas brother of Whittingame about freeing Morton. George Leckie his servant was summoned and interrogated, from which they either got an impression or guessed something or learned nothing definite or perhaps too little. He also assisted the retainers of Douglas Carmichael and Auchinleck as much as he could, risking the utmost rancour among the courtiers. When they were openmouthed at Auchinleck's exploits and had, so to speak, devoured them, he took charge as if it were his own business and placed as guard on Cumlegen castle, a friend and relative of his, John Hume, and dismissed the officer in charge, demanding in the king's name he surrender the castle in favour of John Hume, brother of Manderston. The result was his name

was placed among those to be proscribed at the next parliament. The charge was high treason. They considered he had incurred this by his insolent and arrogant action, tending to open rebellion. Certainly James Stewart of Arran who at that time was all powerful at court on the prompting of Manderston devised plans against his life. Their plan was to entice him to court on some pretext, intercept him when he came, hold him prisoner and heap him with whatever crimes they could. Therefore, they gave him a letter from the King, written in quite a friendly fashion, the burden being because he was Warden of the Eastern Border he should come to court and enlighten them as to what state that post was in and advise accordingly. He, because their malice was suspect or obvious and suspecting trickery afoot, decided not to hurry there rashly nor as they say trust himself to the shallows without exploring them. In order to do so he sent his brother David ahead to Elphinston to make the most discreet and searching investigation as far as he could and warned him to remain there at his uncle's. At the same time he wrote to William Ruthven of Gowrie, then the royal paymaster and to Lord Seton, both related to him. He indicated to them the burden of the royal letter, what he suspected and asked for their advice. The letter carrier was John Leckie who, after handing over the letter saw he was being observed by Alexander of Manderston. Accordingly he hid the replies he got from

Gowrie and Seton in his socks fearing he would be captured, which was the case. And so when captured and his baggage shaken out he deceived them, and on the third day returned to David. He, in accordance with the opinions expressed in the letter, wrote to his brother not to hesitate to place himself in the king's hands as it would be in his best interest and, so that he would arrive safely and not come into the hands of the enemy before he met the king, he should be well escorted. That turned out luckily for him for, accompanied by 60 horsemen, seemingly half-armed but really fully armed with a garment concealing it, he met Arran and Manderston on the sands with 40 horsemen, whether by chance or with the specific object of intercepting him and taking him prisoner. However, when they saw they were ill matched they pretended otherwise and passed by. He went straight to the palace where by chance he found the king in the courtyard with a peaceful expression on his face. Arran and Manderston were immediately behind him and thought he would go first to his lodging, but when they saw how he had been received by the king Arran furiously turned to Seton and roared at him with indignation that he was going to be dismissed (for he was in charge of the king's guard); he had allowed royal enemies and traitors to approach the king and even had led them to him. Seton replied that Wedderburn was neither an enemy or denounced traitor, he had not been led by him to the king, or being



brought, nor could he be, by him, that he had been summoned by a royal letter. If he had anything against him he should act according to the law and he would reply on his own account. Being dismissed, George went to his lodging. An instruction followed in the king's name that he should stay there. He remained there for two days. At length on the third day he sent a note complaining that he had been summoned by the king's command to answer about the Border and yet was being detained like a prisoner though manifestly innocent. He begged that they should give him the opportunity of answering on his own behalf if any should accuse him. He was summoned to the council and went. There he was asked various questions about Angus and Morton to which he replied easily and was sent back to his lodging. On the following day, he was removed to Perth, not obviously unwillingly, and was absent from home at the time when they were cooking up things against Morton and which he could not prevent. There he remained for six months with Gowrie in charge and was treated with great honour by his retainers and held in great favour by his wife and family. But it was not without tedium as he seemed to be in continual custody. However, when he had gone to Edinburgh he had left behind his brother David to deal with future problems. With his help he quelled the calumnies of Joanna Hepburn, his uncle's widow, who alleged that his servants had been violent to the king's servants and



demanded the death penalty. He also curbed the attack of David Hume, Manderston's son called Cranshaws against the land which lies opposite Ramrig and Swinton, which he had received as a gift from the Privy Purse. Relying on George's absence he made the attack and attached himself as litigator and gained some kind of possession. But when David, George's brother, learned what was going on, he wrote to the farmers not to endure it, he would come to their aid if necessary and instructed his brother's retainers to be ready for his call to arms where necessary. He himself went from Edinburgh to Langton to his sister and warned her husband to be ready similarly. Hearing this, Cranshaw desisted. David rushed to the court and repeatedly pressed Gowrie, by nature a delayer, and Seton to see that his brother be freed from custody. At length he succeeded. Various quite fierce quarrels with his relatives awaited his return and this exercised him for some time and to a great extent. With the opposition of the court he stubbornly administered his own law and acted in a lenient fashion, as if with friends, in order to conquer them with gentleness. But they, having become more bold although inferior in might and strength, abused his goodness and patience and were with difficulty reduced to order. John and David Hume of Blackadder the offspring of the men we have talked of before were the ones causing him trouble. David, George's father had started a lawsuit against his uncle

John, the grandfather of this John of Blackadder, over the Barony of Hilton and had left it unfinished at his death. George renewed the suit and finally won, the matter being prolonged and vexed by delays from the court and quibbles of pettyfogging lawyers. There also arose with the same men a dispute about the tithes of Duns, not because they had any rightful claim in law, but alleged they had, and wanted to discuss it amicably among friends, because their uncle John at some point had had the right to them and entrusted the possession to his father. When both had died they claimed the right as their own. George held them leased on honourable terms from Patrick Gats, the minister of the church who had the right. If it was to be contested by law, he said, they should be preferred to him in as much as his grandmother had at one time held them leased from a Douglas and John her son-in-law whom she trusted had been sent to court to secure the right of them for David, George's father, and had gone to great expense over that, but being frustrated had gained the right for his own son. Danielston, however, was put up as an adversary to Gats on whom the right had been conferred by the king. But since he was more recent and Gats had for some time served the charge he was to be preferred, according to canon law. There was no lawsuit about the right nor was the matter of the ownership intricate. However, as is usually done when the right is doubtful, a sequestration order was put on

it, as if aware of the trouble that it could cause, and a royal official sent annually to collect the tithes as sequestrator with the injunction by royal letter that he should be obeyed or if not, the penalty was treason. This was granted in favour of John Hume, brother of Manderston, who pleaded Blackadder's cause at the royal hunt. But George, knowing the law, knew that his claim was supported by law, ignored the letter, the instruction and the sequestration and kept on collecting the tithes himself. When this had been done frequently the request was granted through the same John the huntsman, to put an interdict on him. This was to be done by private letter to the man who was in the habit of reading and signing papers, so that he should not subscribe to any of George's papers relating to the matter. In his charge was the right of signing papers of this kind. Accordingly at the time of the autumn assize George had obtained a paper for signing from two of the land commissioners as is the custom, so that a letter could be composed to suspend the sequestration as unjust. He whose right it was, refused to sign, saying he had been forbidden by the King. George, having received the public instrument of refusal approached the one who had the job of sealing it. He likewise refused and made the same excuse. But George, ignoring this refusal, nonetheless, used the letter as if it were legal and used it to forbid the sequestrator to do what he was supposed

to do in accordance with his office. He drove him out and collected the tithes himself. This action, for which there was no precedent was brought to court and was so approved by the justiciary that with one voice they solemnly swore that there had never been a better suspension made or one with better law or form. Throughout the whole controversy, although his opponents were frequently showing force, George used such moderation, although he could have punished them, since he had greater strength and numbers, that he allowed them neither to beat him by deed or violate him by word. What increased their effrontery also increased their illwill. Manderston and Coldinknowles favoured silence but did not make common cause with them. On one occasion Coldinknowles, gathering the retainers he could, set out, but when it was understood that George was in the field he returned home, knowing he would meet him on an unequal footing. Finally, in order to make an end of opposing not so much them as the king, fearing that he might at some point offend him and in order to prevent being calumnated by his private enemies, he allowed the matter to be settled by common friends. Accordingly, preserving for himself only the tithes of his farms and a few others which he had granted to his dependants, he gave up the rest. Thereupon, it was evident what attitude that courtly hunter had to the Blackadders, who transferred all right and profit to himself and enjoyed it as long as

he lived. When he died, it was by George's efforts that it came to the Blackadders and he after so many injuries had so much care for that family. When, likewise, George had legally obtained the whole barony of Hilton and the great indemnities, on account of it being occupied by force, he could have exhausted the whole of their patrimony, yet he so tempered the situation that he allowed half to be possessed by them and remitted the indemnities. Moreover, when the lands had to be divided among the girls as heiresses, he kept them undivided, giving them dowries from himself as their relative. He even gave his sister's granddaughter Haldane as wife to John, dowered with quite a large sum of money. All this was done with a rare humanity and generosity after so many injuries. They had attempted everything in vain as if not to become liable to his benefactions. Previously he had given all those lands to his brother David when he was angry with them, with no regression or reversion reserved for himself. But David, with a like moderation, lest his advantage should be a hindrance to family harmony, voluntarily gave up what he had received, keeping only the right to the tithes of Darnchester, which George up to that time had kept in his own control, and this was the end of these wrangles. A somewhat greater and more bitter dispute ensued with John Kerr his brother-in-law. He had brought to his house the adulterous wife of Innerwick, abducted from her husband.

First, there was divorce from his lawful wife, then a lawsuit concerning restitution of dowry and wedding presents. Finally it came to arms, for John, because the dowry had not been returned along with other goods, was denounced as a rebel and his goods confiscated and given to his wife. She, abandoned, settled with George who reacted somewhat slowly to the expectation that Kerr would return to sanity, at least for the children of whom he had five, one boy and four girls and for their mother, which, if they got enough to live honourably and in accordance with the dignity of both, would be enough. He was advised by his brother David, who was less tolerant of the injury done to his sister, indignant that Kerr had so dared, that they had been insulted; and that George seemed to be laggardly and was thus seen by Kerr. Also he was indignant that goodwill was expected freely, that he made laws for himself so that force would have to be applied and he should be brought to order. To do this, he would drive away Kerr's cattle which were at Hirsell and bring them to Wedderburn. When he understood this was a true statement, George agreed and David, making a sortie as far as the Tweed, (which is a mile beyond Hirsell where Kerr lived) drove off as many cattle and oxen as he could at such a slow pace that there was time to inform Kerr's uncle Edmonston, who lived four miles from there, to get there before they reached Darnchester, which is a mile beyond Hirsell. The uncle begged that



the cattle be sent back, that he would stand surety for Kerr to give satisfaction about everything before an appointed day - if not, he would return the cattle. Since they could not agree, they departed, leaving the matter unfinished and Kerr in no way taking heed. The day before he had boasted in the presence of that self same relative who warned him to take care, that no one would attempt such a thing and if they did, he himself would punish them severely. There was a more serious encounter several months later when, after an official was sent, Kerr having been ordered to do so, gave up the stronghold of Hirscl, but took up position in the nearby granaries. George had placed in command of the stronghold his youngest brother and twenty four soldiers. Arranging a truce for three days, George returned home. Kerr in order to cause trouble, forbade the garrison, which was in the stronghold, to fetch water on some empty pretext that the river which was about 100 paces away was his not theirs. Hume, not accepting that, led out his men, ready for battle, and when they had got enough water led them back, and sending a message to George, informed him of the violation of the truce. George sent David to help his brother with 80 horsemen and instructed them to capture Kerr. But he, forewarned from some source or by awareness of what he deserved, had secretly withdrawn himself and all his belongings before they arrived. He had driven the cattle across the Tweed to the fields of

Verca and had himself gone into Teviotdale to raise as large a band as he possibly could. When David had tracked him in vain, he crossed the Tweed to bring back the cattle. He waited for them at leisure with no one trying to prevent him, but no way could he get them to go into the water. He believed the sheep would follow when the lambs were taken across by boat, but in vain. About the ninth hour, 3 p.m. he was informed that Kerr had collected quite a numerous band of footsoldiers as well as horsemen and would soon be present. He decided to wait for him in case he got the reputation of cowardly retreat and flight. Meanwhile, he ordered the crops which were in the barns at Spylaw to be brought into the stronghold and when Kerr came into sight with 120 horsemen and 300 foot, removing the horses and enclosing them within the stronghold, he drew his men up on a little hill and gave the opportunity for battle. Kerr passed by, threateningly with his horsemen and stationed them on a hill a mile away, past which the Hume reinforcements were likely to come. He ordered his foot soldiers to stand in line 400 yards from the stronghold. David sent messengers to all his friends advising them how things stood and asking them to come in time to help. They did not delay, although George himself was absent that particular day, having gone to Thirlestane. Nevertheless, without sloth they assembled before 9 o'clock at Darnchester, up to 700 men both horse and foot

less than 3 furlongs from Kerr, within sight of him. David realised by various messages from an other direction that they had the men of Teviotdale on the other side and he did not know who and how great they were. In order to find out, he placed Gavin Ford on his horse and instructed him to gallop across, avoiding the enemy by a long detour, and ascertain if they were of equal numbers to those against them, to come back to his men without delay, and if they tried anything, to give battle. He said he would enter conflict, although his numbers were less, as he had better armed soldiers against an irregular and half armed rabble of footsoldiers. On receiving this news, they advanced directly on the enemy and he and his men, with spears erect, rushed up as if to launch an attack. But when the enemy saw they were coming on fearlessly, setting off several small pieces, they did not bother to wait and the footmen retreated in front of David, and those who were alongside David caught up with them although they had rushed off at the first shot of the small cannon. He waited for his men to reassemble and then advanced against the enemy in a column. They withdrew and did not attempt battle. David, content that he had driven them off without a fight, intended to delay his men so that in slow pursuit they might let the enemy get away and not make a slaughter, until one of his company, Manderston riding rashly against them, received a wound

on the thigh. Roused by that, as if by a trumpet, the men of the Merse rose to take vengeance. But Kerr and his men fearing that, had taken to flight and taking the route nearest to England, before the Merse men could catch up with them, reached the Tweed along a narrow steep path with each pressing on the other, and where pursuit was difficult. Although 50 small cannon had been placed on the very bank of the river, they crossed safely with only one horse killed and no one wounded.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography is arranged as follows:

1. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES, arranged by archive.
2. PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES.
3. SECONDARY WORKS.
4. UNPUBLISHED THESES.

## 1. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

BRITISH LIBRARY, LONDON  
Stowe MSS 174.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, EDINBURGH  
DC 5, 50\1  
DC 5, 50\2  
LA 111 249

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND, EDINBURGH  
MS 6.1.13  
MS 34.6.21  
Advocates MS 17.1.19  
Advocates MS 31.6.12  
Advocates MS 31.6.13

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, LONDON  
SP 14\57

SCOTTISH RECORD OFFICE, EDINBURGH  
CH 2\307  
GD 267  
RDI\449  
TD 87\86

## 2. PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Acts of the Lords of Council in Public Affairs, 1501-1554: Selections from Acta Dominorum Concilii, ed. R.K. Hannay (Edinburgh, 1932).

The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes, 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1814-75).

Aldis, H.G. (ed.), List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700 (Edinburgh, 1970).

Bannatyne Miscellany, 3 vols. (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1827-55).

Barlow, W., The Summe and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court, January 14 1604 (London, 1604).

Calderwood, David, History of the Kirk of Scotland, ed. T. Thomson, 8 vols. (Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842-9).

Calendar of Border Papers, 1560-94, ed. J. Bain, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1894)

Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603, ed. J. Bain et al., 13 vols. (Edinburgh, 1898-1969).

Camden, William, Britannia (London, 1610).

Colville, John, Original Letters of Mr John Colville, 1582-1603, ed. D. Laing (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1888).

A Diurnal of Remarkable Occurents ... since the Death of King James the Fourth till the year 1575 (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1833).

Drummond, Sir William, of Hawthornden, The History of Scotland from the year 1423 until the year 1542 (London, 1655).

Epistolae Jacobi Quarti, Jacobi Quinti et Mariae Regum Scotorum, ed T. Ruddiman (Edinburgh, 1722-4).

Fraser, Sir William, The Douglas Book (Edinburgh, 1885).

Hamilton Papers, ed. J. Bain, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1890-92).

Historical Manuscripts Commission, 12th Report, part viii: Milne Hume of Wedderburn (London, 1902).

Hooker, Richard, The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (London, 1594).

Hume, David, Apologia Basilica seu Machiavelli ingenium examinatum in libro quem Princeps inscripsit (Paris, 1626).

Hume, David, History of the House of Douglas and Angus (Edinburgh, 1644).

Hume, David, Davidis Humii de familia Humia Wedderburnensi liber, ed. J. Miller (Abbotsford Club, Edinburgh, 1839).

Hume, David, Jacobea (Paris, 1639).



Hume, David, Poemata Omnia (Paris, 1639).

Hume, David, Lusus Poetici (Paris, 1604).

Hume, David, Daphn Amaryllis (Paris, 1604).

Hume, David, (of Duras), Lettres et traitez christiens pleins d'instructions et consolations morales et saintes (Bergen, 1613).

Johnson, John, Inscriptiones Historicae Regum Scotorum in Delicæ Poetarum Scotorum (Edinburgh, 1637).

Knox, John, History of the Reformation in Scotland, ed. W.C. Dickinson, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1949).

Lamb, W., Ane Resonyng of Ane Scottis and Inglis Merchand betuix rouand and lionis, ed. R.J. Lyall (Aberdeen, 1985).

Le Livre du Recteur de l'Academie de Genève, 1559-1878, ed. S. Stelling-Michaud (Geneva, 1959).

Lesley, John, The History of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1830).

Lindsay, Robert (of Pitscottie), The History of Scotland from 1436 to 1565, ed. R. Freebairn, (Edinburgh, 1728).

Melville, James, Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melville, ed. R. Pitcairn, (Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842).

Melville, Sir James (of Halhill), Memoires (London, 1693).

Milton, J, A History of Britain (London, 1671).

Milton, J, God's free mercy to England (London, 1641).

Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney, ed. K. Duncan-Jones and J.A. Van Dorsten (Oxford, 1973).

Monro, J., His Expedition with the worthy Scots Regiment (London, 1637).

Complete Works of Sir Thomas More, ed. C. Muller, L. Bradner and C. Lynch (London, 1984).

Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum, ed. M. Livingston et al., 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1908- ).

Rhymer, Thomas, Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae ... 20 vols. (London, 1704-35).

St. Andrews Formulare, 1514-1546, 2 vols. (Stair Society, Edinburgh, 1942-4).

Scot, William, Deliciae Poetarum Scotorum Huius Aeri Illustrium (Amsterdam, 1637).

Select Biographies, ed. W. Tweedie (Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1845).

The Works of Sir Philip Sidney, ed. A. Feuillerat (Cambridge, 1963).

Sidney, Sir Philip, An Apology for Poetry, ed. G. Shepherd (London, 1965).

Wedderburn, Robert, Complaynt of Scotland (Paris, 1550).

Wedderburn, Robert. The Complaynt of Scotland, ed. A.M. Stewart (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1979).

Wodrow Miscellany, ed. D. Laing (Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1844).

The Works of Sir Philip Sidney, ed. A. Fenillerat (Cambridge, 1963).

### 3. SECONDARY WORKS

Allan, D., Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment, (Edinburgh, 1993).

Bannerman, J., 'The King's poet and the inauguration of Alexander III,' SHR, lxviii (1989).

Binns, J.W. (ed.), Latin Poetry of Latin Poets (London, 1974).

Braden, G., The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry (Yale, 1978).

Brown, K., Bloodfeud in Scotland 1573-1625 (Edinburgh, 1985).

Brown, K., 'Aristocratic finances and the origins of the Scottish Revolution,' English Historical Review, civ (1989).

Brown, P. Hume, George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer (Edinburgh, 1890).

Buxton, J., Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance (London, 1968).

Cowan, E., 'Myth and identity in early medieval Scotland,' SHR, lxiii (1984).

Cummings, R., 'Drummond's Forth Feasting: A panegyric for King James in Scotland, The Seventeenth Century, ii (1987).

- Dilworth, M., 'Coldingham Priory and the Reformation,' Innes Review, xxiii (1972).
- Donaldson, G., 'Scottish presbyterian exiles in England, 1584-8,' RSCHS, xiv (1962).
- Donaldson, G., All the Queen's Men: Power and Politics in Mary Stewart's Scotland (London, 1983).
- Donaldson, G., Scotland: James V - James VII (Edinburgh, 1965).
- Donaldson, G., Scottish Church History (Edinburgh, 1985).
- Douglas, Sir Robert, The Baronage of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1798).
- Duncan, A.A.M., Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom (Edinburgh, 1975).
- Dwyer, J., Mason, R. and Murdoch, A. (eds.), New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland (Edinburgh, 1982).
- English Humanism: Wyatt to Cowley, ed. J. Martindale (London, 1885).
- Evans, M., English Poetry in the Sixteenth Century (London, 1955).
- Ferguson, W., Scotland's Relations with England: A Survey to 1707 (Edinburgh, 1977).
- Ford, P., George Buchanan, Prince of Poets (Aberdeen, 1982).
- Graves-Law, T., Collected Essays and Reviews (Edinburgh, 1904).
- Greg, W.W., Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama (London, 1905).
- Haag, E. and E., La France protestante, 2 vols. (Paris, 1846-59). ??
- Haldane, A., The Haldanes of Gleneagles (Edinburgh, 1921).
- Haynes, A., Invisible Power (London, 1992).
- Head, D.H., 'Henry VII's Scottish policy,' SHR, lxi (1982).
- Hewitt, G., Scotland under Morton, 1572-80 (Edinburgh, 1982).
- Howell, R., Sir Philip Sidney, The Shepherd Knight (London, 1968).
- Ijsewynm, J., A Companion to Neo-Latin Studies, (Amsterdam, 1980).

Jack, R.D.S. (ed.), A History of Scottish Literature, vol. i, Origins to 1660 (Aberdeen, 1988).

Jack, R.D.S., 'William Fowler and Italian literature,' Modern Language Review, lxxv (1970).

Johnston, G., 'The first edition of Godscroft's History,' Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, iv (1901).

Lee, M., 'Scotland and the general crisis of the seventeenth century,' SHR, lxxiii (1984).

Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M., Roman Civilisation: Selected Readings (New York, 1990).

Longman Companion to English Literature, ed. G. Christopher (London, 1972).

Lyall, R.J., 'Politics and poetry in fifteenth and sixteenth century Scotland,' Scottish Literary Journal, iii, no. 2 (1976).

Lynch, M., Scotland: A New History (London, 1991).

Lynch, M. (ed.), Mary Stewart: Queen in Three Kingdoms (Oxford, 1988).

MacFarlane, I.D., Renaissance Latin Poetry (Manchester, 1980).

MacQueen, J. (ed.), Humanism in Renaissance Scotland (Edinburgh, 1990).

The Maitland Miscellany, 4 vols. (Maitland Society, 1833-47).

Mattzahn, N., Tudor Historical Thought (San Marino, 1967).

Maxwell, H., A History of the House of Douglas (London, 1902).

McCrie, T., The Life of Andrew Melville (Edinburgh, 1824).

McGladdery., C., James II (Edinburgh, 1990).

Mason, R. (ed.), Scotland and England, 1286-1815 (Edinburgh, 1987).

Mason, R., Scots and Britons (Cambridge, 1994).

Michel, F., Les Écossais en France, Les Français en Écosse, 2 vols. (Paris, 1862).

Mullan, D.G., Episcopacy in Scotland, 1560-1638 (Edinburgh, 1986).

New Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse, ed. E. Jones (Oxford, 1991).

Nichols, F.J. (ed.), An Anthology of Neo-Latin Poetry (New Haven, 1979).

Oxford Companion to French Literature, ed. P. Harvey and J. Heseltine (Oxford, 1959).

Oxford History of English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660, ed. D. Bush (2nd rev. edn., Oxford, 1962).

Perosa, A. and Sparrow, J. (eds.), Renaissance Latin Verse: an Anthology (London, 1979).

Phillips, J.E., 'George Buchanan and the Sidney Circle,' Huntingdon Library Quarterly, xii (1948).

Rae, T.I., The Administration of the Scottish Frontier, 1513-1603 (Edinburgh, 1966).

Rooseboom, M.P., The Scottish Staple in the Netherlands (The Hague, 1910).

Ryan, L., 'Neo-Latin literature in the present state of scholarship,' in The Present State of Scholarship in 16th Century Literature, ed. W.M. Jones (Columbia, Missouri, 1978).

Scotland, J., A History of Scottish Education, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1965).

Smith, A.G.R. (ed.), The Reign of James VI and I (London, 1973).

Spenser, Edmund, The Faerie Queen, ed. P.C. Bagley, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1965-6).

Syme, R., The Roman Revolution (Oxford, 1939).

Thomson, P. (ed.), The Critical Heritage (London, 1974).

Upton, C., 'National internationalism: Scottish literature and the international audience in the seventeenth century,' SSL, xxvi (1991).

Wallace, M., The Life of Sir Philip Sidney (Cambridge, 1965).

Watkins, D.C., The Puritan Experience (London, 1972).

Williamson, A., 'A patriot nobility? Calvinist kin ties and civic humanism,' SHR, lxxii (1993).

Williamson, A., Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI (Edinburgh, 1979).

Willson, D.H., King James VI and I (London, 1959).

Wormald, J., Lords and Men in Scotland, 1442-1603 (Edinburgh, 1985).

#### 4. UNPUBLISHED THESES

Goodare, J., 'Parliament and society in Scotland, 1560-1603', (University of Edinburgh Ph.D., 1989).

Meikle, M., 'Lairds and gentlemen: a study of the landed families of the eastern Anglo-Scottish borders, 1540-1603' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D., 1989).